Subject: Re: avoiding for loops Posted by steinhh on Thu, 12 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <364a6d1a.35772978@news1.alterdial.uu.net> IbryanNOSPAM@arete-az.com (Lisa Bryan) writes:

- > I've had such good luck recently with y'all that I thought I'd send
- > another one. Although this is a little less esoteric. I need to
- > apply a median filter all the way to the edges of an image. So I came
- > up with putting an edge around it the width of the filter then
- > selecting out the original region. Sort of what convol does
- > automatically.

>

- > The following code is what I came up with. It works, but it is clunky
- > as heck. I know some of you guys are wizzes at getting rid of loops.
- > Care to lend a hand?

- > p.s. the data I'm working on array 4000x512 arrays not 100x100!
- Ok. Though posting code on the net may expose bugs!

Your lines

- temp(i,azrange-1+n:azrange-1+2\*n) = temp(i,azrange+n-2)> and
- temp(shotrange-1+n:shotrange-1+2\*n,i) = temp(shotrange +n 2,i) do have some flaws.

The "temp(n,n) = bottshade" statement has initialized all values inside temp(n:shotrange+n-1,n:azrange+n-1), so here you're overwriting one row/column too much. That in itself is ok, but that probably led you to take the value from the wrong column/row (e.g. azrange+n-2 instead of azrange+n-1). If I'm not completely lost, lines should read

```
temp(i,azrange+n:azrange-1+2*n) = temp(i,azrange+n-1)
and temp(shotrange+n:shotrange-1+2*n,i) = temp(shotrange +n - 1,i)
```

But now, for a version without loops. This is indeed my favourite loop killing mechanism:

```
temp = fltarr(shotrange +2*n,azrange +2*n)
temp(n,n) = bottshade
```

;; Expand and copy first/last column of \*bottshade\* into place

temp(0,n) = rebin(bottshade(0,\*),n,azrange)

temp(shotrange+n,n) = rebin(bottshade(shotrange-1,\*),n,azrange)

;; Expand and copy bottom/top row of \*temp\* into place

temp(0,0) = rebin(temp(\*,n),shotrange+2\*n,n)temp(0,azrange+n) = rebin(temp(\*,azrange+n-1),shotrange+2\*n,n)

;; Done!

I haven't timed it, but it should save you a lot of time. There are other ways of doing this (matrix multiplication) but the principle is the same: "Fan out" a column or row so it becomes a 2-d array that only needs to be patched in at the right place.

Personally I don't like the matrix multiplication method, but that's mostly for esthetic reasons. Although I do remember we did some timing tests on stuff like this ages ago, I don't remember which one was the fastest - I would guess it's architecture dependent as well. The difference wasn't all that big, though.

Regards,

Stein Vidar