
Subject: Re: IDL subroutine improvements
Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Wed, 21 Apr 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wbiagiot@suffolk.lib.ny.us writes:

>
> To all,
>
> This is a really small issue. I'm just wondering if anyone else has
> submitted an improvement to an existing IDL subroutine to RSI and seen it
> incorporated into a subsequent version of IDL? A while back I submitted
> (what I considered to be) a significant speed enhancement to the cross
> correlate and auto correlate functions with only minor modifications. My
> benchmarks were showing me about a 60%+ speed improvement (which is important
> if your code is constantly banging on these functions, like mine was). I had
> to convince the rep over a couple of emails what the advantage/improvement
> was.
>

I was in a similar position. I found an inconsistency in CONGRID --
which still exists today, by the way. I reported it for version 4 of
IDL, and I convinced RSI tech support people that it truly was an
inconsistency. Unfortunately it was never corrected.

Craig

P.S. My corrected version is CMCONGRID, and is available at
<http://astrog.physics.wisc.edu/~craigm/idl/idl.html> The operative
keyword is HALF_HALF.

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@astrog.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response

Subject: Re: IDL subroutine improvements
Posted by [rkling](#) on Wed, 21 Apr 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <7fkld2\$1jo\$1@nnrp1.dejanews.com>,
wbiagiot@suffolk.lib.ny.us wrote:

> Anyway, was just wondering. BTW, if anyone wants these two functions, just
> drop me a line. Maybe DF or RK would consider another subsection for their
> sites - user-optimized IDL routines (same functionality).
>

> -Bill B.

I had not thought of doing something like that, but I like the idea. I know that I have modified a lot of the IDL routines for my own use (especially the compound widgets). As always, the biggest pain will be the documentation. I will add it to the list of things to do!

-Ronn

-----== Posted via Deja News, The Discussion Network ==-----
<http://www.dejanews.com/> Search, Read, Discuss, or Start Your Own

Subject: Re: IDL subroutine improvements
Posted by [<asowter](#) on Thu, 22 Apr 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jeez, this is a real bummer. As a commercial IDL user, I've been sold partially on it's flexibility to upgrade. It's also a personal bummer as I'm a regular user of the correlation and CONGRID functions.....!

Andy

Craig Markwardt wrote in message ...

>
>
> wbiagiot@suffolk.lib.ny.us writes:
>>
>> To all,
>>
>> This is a really small issue. I'm just wondering if anyone else has
>> submitted an improvement to an existing IDL subroutine to RSI and seen it
>> incorporated into a subsequent version of IDL? A while back I submitted
>> (what I considered to be) a significant speed enhancement to the cross
>> correlate and auto correlate functions with only minor modifications. My
>> benchmarks were showing me about a 60%+ speed improvement (which is
important
>> if your code is constantly banging on these functions, like mine was). I
had
>> to convince the rep over a couple of emails what the
advantage/improvement
>> was.
>>
>
> I was in a similar position. I found an inconsistency in CONGRID --
> which still exists today, by the way. I reported it for version 4 of
> IDL, and I convinced RSI tech support people that it truly was an
> inconsistency. Unfortunately it was never corrected.

>
> Craig
>
