
Subject: Re: 6.3 reactions?

Posted by [Mark Hadfield](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 21:58:01 GMT

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

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%).

--

Mark Hadfield "Kei puwaha te tai nei, Hoesa tahi tatou"
m.hadfield@niwa.co.nz
National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA)
