
Subject: Re: IDLtoAVIGENERATOR gives unexpected output when dimension is not power of 2?

Posted by [Haje Korth](#) on Tue, 09 Jan 2007 18:07:56 GMT

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

Hi,
the dlm grabs the list of video for windows codecs from the OS (don't use any quicktime codecs, they won't work). When you install the codec it contains the routine that registers the codec with the OS for further use. You can get links to codecs and info here: <http://www.fourcc.org/>. Also Reimar Bauer answered a post to me a while ago about using Flash. There seem to be some free options out there. Just google the newsgroups.

Haje

"biophys" <biophys@gmail.com> wrote in message
news:1168331781.447772.116590@v33g2000cww.googlegroups.com.. .
> Haje and Rick,
>
> Thanks for the replies. It's good to know that the size has to be
> divisible by 4,8,16. For the codecs listed in IDLtoAVIGENERATOR.dlm, I
> was testing mostly with fullframe(uncompressed) and cinepack. I googled
> and found out that cinpack compressed with 4x4 data chunks. All size
> that can be divisible by 4 works perfectly with fullframe and cinepack
> as well as microsoft video 1. I still have no luck with other codecs
> listed there. Maybe that's not very important since cinepack seems to
> give reasonable balance between size and quality. I am used to use flc
> format under unix/linux and sometimes convert them into divx. I am
> curious about what do you guys use today for scientific animations? How
> do you add codecs to this dlm. Is the source of IDLtoAVI generally
> available? Flash would be great if there is an easy and free
> implementation. Unfortunately it is not free.
>
> BP
>
>
> Rick Towler wrote:
>> The issue is most likely related to the fact that your frame sizes
>> aren't evenly divisible by 4, 8, or 16. To be safe, your frame sizes
>> should be divisible by 8 and some codecs are optimized for 16. I am
>> stumped as to why the demo 300x400 works but your code doesn't. I
> oops, it seem to work now, maybe I feeded a wrong size other than
> 300x400
>> suspect that you used different codecs between the test and your code.
>> I'll guess the test was done with the cinepack codec?
>>
>> Stick with "legal" frame sizes and you should have better luck.

```
>>  
>> -Rick  
>>  
>
```
