Are you sure the "Note" field will do more good than harm?

I've looked at three Uranus images so far (admittedly all from the same sequence), and they all contained the same egregiously wrong information in the Note field of the .LBL file.

NOTE =
"1 OF 46 FRAMES IMAGING RING STRUCTURE AND SHEPHERD SATELLITES."

Noooo.

2681942, 2681948, and 2681954 are 3 of 6 frames imaging Uranus at 19 deg phase angle. 2682000, 2682006, and 2682012 are the other three, and yes, I just checked, their NOTE field is wrong too.

[NO CHANGES. The NOTE fields are from the original CDROMs and we are not able to maintain or validate this information directly. Instead, we have included expanded caveats in ERRATA.TXT and TUTORIAL.TXT, pointing out that the TARGET_NAME and NOTE fields are not 100% reliable, and that OPUS should provide more reliable search results.]

Target mis-identifications

"Please be aware that some targets have been found to be mis-identified in the index files. We have corrected those that have been brought to our attention, but some mis-identifications are likely to remain. Please report any known errors to the PDS Rings Node."

[The above quote is from the errata.txt of the 6xxx volumes, it is item (4) in the errata of the 7xxx volumes and is not included in the 5xxx nor the 8xxx volumes. In these images the target is identified as Uranus, but the note is wrong. We expanded the caveat to include the note fields and included it in ERRATA.TXT and TUTORIAL.TXT on all volumes.]

High-pass-filtered Uranus images

I've put two Uranus images with the average of an 11x11 surrounding box subtracted from each pixel in the krages/public directory on files.seti.org. And if you remember how to get to krages/public without first logging in as krages and giving my password, would you please remind me, because I've forgotten.

The files are boxc2681948.fits and boxc2681954.fits. That's right. FITS. For reasons that pass understanding, xv has decided to stop working for real and halfword VICAR images; I have no intention of actually trying to install VICAR; and don't get me started on Nasaview. If I want to create them and then look at them, they have to be .fits.

The images show the "instrumental" structure that is not removed by

the standard calibration. (They also show a bright feature at 35deg S which may have lasted until 2011, but that's another subject.) The part that is relevant here is the noticeable quasi-periodic line-to-line and column-to-column variation. [NO CHANGE. We reviewed the images and found that the artifacts are present in the raw images. As a result, we do not feel that we are in a position to address them. We have to trust users to recognize that any digital data can contain instrumental artifacts.]

- There are images Nasaview won't open properly

C1138739_GEOMED
C1138746_GEOMED
C1138755_GEOMED

These images open with a severely wrong stretch -- essentially all black. [NO CHANGES. The JPEG versions of these images demonstrate that the images are fine (although it should be noted that the second image of the three is essentially blank anyway). We suspect that the files contain scattered bright pixels that are not obvious to the eye but which can throw off the auto-stretching algorithm of Nasaview.]

Attempting to obtain a histogram frequently causes Nasaview to crash.

I've already mentioned my lack of enamoration with Nasaview. I can't see any significant difference between the .LBL files for these images and 1138727 or 1138733, which it opens fine. But if you know anybody involved with Nasaview, you might want to try and find out what it's choking on. [NO CHANGES. We will contact the Nasaview developers, but this does not indicate problems with the data set.]

- What are all the bright specks?

Image on the right: your C1139221_GEOMED.IMG
Image on the left: my own copy of the same image

Both have the same stretch (-0.02 to 0.32).

Same region of both is shown [_FITS_ coordinates 200,625 (upper left) to 400,500 (lower right); also shown by the blue rectangle in the thumbnail at the upper right of the window].

Your version has a lot of bright speckles in it that don't have to be there. The region I selected contains three. [FIXED. This was the result of ADESPIKE having been inadvertently used on some images rather than the superior DESPIKE. All images have been re-processed using DESPIKE.]