
Subject: Re: Problem with MJ2 extension
Posted by [Mark\[1\]](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 21:37:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On May 28, 12:14 am, "Haje Korth" <haje.ko...@nospam.jhuapl.edu> wrote:

- > I agree that the MJ2 format is still poorly supported. But the fact that no
- > inter-frame compression is used is THE advantage of the format. This way
- > each image accurately represents the underlying scientific dataset and
- > individual images are not smeared by the codec algorithm. It is accuracy
- > that matters, not file size!

It depends on the purpose, obviously, and there are purposes for which MJ2 is appropriate (or will be when it's more widely supported) however those purposes generally don't match my needs.

However I would like to dispute your suggestion that inter-frame compression necessarily degrades accuracy. In principle, animations with inter-frame compression can store all the information required to reconstruct any given frame, it's just that they spread it over several frames.

For scenes with a limited number of colours, the old-style AVI codecs like Microsoft RLE (8-bit) and Microsoft Video 1 (16-bit) work very well. These use simple intra-frame compression plus simple inter-frame compression. They are either lossless (RLE) or nearly so (Video 1) and they achieve reasonably small file sizes and very fast playback.
