

---

Subject: Re: 6.3 reactions?

Posted by [R.Bauer](#) on Thu, 04 May 2006 08:26:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mark Hadfield wrote:

> Michael Galloy wrote:

>

>> I'm pretty excited to see whether or not Motion JPEG 2000 is as great  
>> for animations as it seems at first glance. MPEG has always seemed to  
>> be a bad format for scientific visualization; Motion JPEG 2000  
>> corrects a lot of its weaknesses.

>

>

> I did some quick experiments: Files take a long time to write (with  
> default parameters). I haven't found anything (other than IDL and a few  
> high-end video editing programs) that will read them.

>

> In my experience the best format for scientific animations by far is AVI  
> (Microsoft Video 1 codec, set quality to a highish value like 85%).

>

>

I do prefer flash swf because you could add text with it's font

e.g. <http://swftools.org>

cheers

Reimar

--

Reimar Bauer

Institut fuer Stratosphaerische Chemie (ICG-I)

Forschungszentrum Juelich

email: [R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de](mailto:R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de)

-----  
a IDL library at Forschungszentrum Juelich  
[http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg-i/idl\\_icglib/idl\\_lib\\_intro.html](http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg-i/idl_icglib/idl_lib_intro.html)

=====