

Re: Mac Word 2004 Templates yield HUGE filesizes when used by Windows machines?

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Mac/microsoft.public.mac.office.word/2004-11/0122.html>

From: John McGhie (john_at_mcghie.name)

Date: 11/04/04

Date: Thu, 04 Nov 2004 22:52:44 +1100

Hi Philip:

Hmmm... That's a challenge :-)

1) Unless you are still using the SE30, you should be specifying 96 dpi, not 72 dpi. One of the secrets to this process is to set the graphic at the native resolution of the target device so nothing has to do any resampling.

On Mac and Windows that's 96 dpi these days.

2) Another "secret" is Do Not Scale or Stretch the graphic in Word. You "can", and on Windows its perfectly OK to do so, On the Mac, it seems to result in pixelation more often than not.

Instead, use a proper graphics application to resample the image to the actual size you want it to appear at, and embed that in Word at 100 per cent.

Since you mention that you want the image to work on the web, I am avoiding talk of vector formats. I know that various companies are working on vector formats for the web, but support for them is patchy. Illustrator does Scalable Vector Graphics. Corel does their own flavour. Visio does something else. By default, Microsoft's EMZ seems to be catching on since Internet Explorer supports it.

To get a raster to look "gorgeous" in PDF, you need to render it at 900 dpi or better. If you do, I wouldn't bother putting it on the Web, everyone will click away long before they have downloaded it.

If the source picture is a photograph, you really need to use JPEG. For the web, set the resolution to 96 DPI. For printing, use 300. For publishing, use 900.

Hope this helps

On 4/11/04 9:42 AM, in article uVbA5ZfwEHA.3584@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl,

"Phillip M. Jones, CE.T." <pjones@kimbanet.com> wrote:

> *I am offended!! First time I've ever been called a Troll!!*
> :-(
>
> *As much as I have used a computer and a Mac (my first was first Gen
> SE/30 how's that for a long time). I really didn't know.*
>
> *However; I will get over it. I have been chastised, and laughed at all
> my life. :-)*
>
> *And I am sure you didn't mean it. :-)*
>
> *Okay now since you've explained. What format pray tell, can I use in a
> word document that looks absolutely gorgous in Word and will also look
> so in a PDF to placed on a Website. I tried PNG and it didn't seem to be
> any better. infact I've tried several formats and they all look fuzzy
> even on the website. I've even tried saving the pdf at 144dpi resolution
> instead of 72dpi.*
>
> *some of the images I would need are Pics from a Digital Camera that only
> uses jpg output, then I have some logos saved in .cgm. Then I have
> images I scan with a scanner using a SANE-Twain Driver.*
>
> *John McGhie wrote:*
>> *Hi Phillip:*
>>
>> *I think you're trolling, because I am sure YOU already know the answer to
>> the question :-)*
>>
>> *The answer is "No". Basically, the explanation is this:*
>>
>> *There are two kinds of graphics, raster and vector.*
>>
>> *In a raster graphic, the image is made up of discrete picture elements
>> (pixels) laid out in rows and columns (a raster). The picture is stored in
>> a format similar to that in which it appears on a screen, lines of dots.
>> Because there are a fixed number of dots, the picture has a fixed
>> resolution. To make the image print smaller, you remove some dots. To make
>> it print larger, you copy neighbouring dots.*
>>
>> *In a vector graphic, the image is composed of mathematical formulae, one for
>> each object. The formula is an equation that describes the shape of the
>> object. It contains a "scale" which is a number that tells how much to
>> multiply the quantities in the equation by to produce the size. To print
>> the image larger, simply increase the scale number. To print it smaller,
>> reduce the scale. The resolution of the image is infinite, and you can
>> theoretically scale the image to any size you like without losing any
>> detail.*
>>
>> *Now, JPEG and GIF graphics are both raster graphics. Worse, they are*

>> "lossy" compression formats. To make a GIF or a JPEG you remove some of the
>> information (in GIF, you approximate the colour of each pixel so that the
>> image never contains more than 256 different colours, in JPEG, you do some
>> of that and some removing of pixels). So the answer to Phillip's first
>> question is always "No". Not only do GIF and JPEG have a fixed resolution
>> that is well below that of an EPS, they also contain less colour
>> information. So an EPS made from a GIF or JPEG can never look any better
>> than the original GIF or JPEG did. In fact, the EPS will simply contain a
>> copy of the original, wrapped in a postscript header.

>>

>> EPS and PDF are very similar formats. They are both PostScript code
>> internally. The difference is that EPS is "encapsulated" so an application
>> can embed it in another file or document and have the combination print out.
>> PDF (Portable Document Format) is "Packaged". The file contains not only
>> the PostScript code that tells the receiving printer (or screen) how to
>> print or display the image, it also contains the fonts needed to do that
>> with, and bookmarks and hyperlinks with which you can navigate.

>>

>> So the answer to Phillip's second question is "It Depends..." :-)

>>

>> If you produce a "High End Publishing" PDF, then the image will be at full
>> resolution and therefore extremely high quality. The file will be huge:
>> more than a hundred megabytes is not uncommon. *I* will not be downloading
>> it from your website, and many computers outside a print professional's
>> workshop do not have enough power to produce one. If you produce one from a
>> Word document (and I will, next week) the resolution of the pictures within
>> it will be as good as they were in the original document. So if your
>> document contains fuzzy JPEGs, you will get very accurately described fuzzy
>> JPEGs in the final result.

>>

>> If you produce a PDF "Optimised for Web Display", the file will be much,
>> much smaller: little larger than an HTML equivalent. However, the
>> resolution of all of the images will be reduced to 96 dots per inch. On a
>> computer screen, you will not see any difference between it and the Word
>> original. But if you print it, you will wish you hadn't: it will be very
>> fuzzy.

>>

>> Adobe's Acrobat 6 gives you unlimited options to trade off resolution vs
>> file size vs processing time. You decide which are important to you and set
>> the PDF writer up accordingly.

>>

>> Now, I am convinced that Phillip knew all of that, but I thought I would
>> type it all out for the folks who are new around here. Which is probably
>> why Phillip asked the question :-)

>>

>> Hope this helps

>>

>> On 3/11/04 6:32 AM, in article OCTi4KRwEHA.1292@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl,
>> "Phillip M. Jones, CE.T." <pjones@kimbanet.com> wrote:

>>

>>

>>> *Can you take a jpeg of Gif Graphic in GraphicConverter and convert to a
>>> decent looking EPS File?*
>>>
>>> *And what about Word documents with graphics that you want to publish on
>>> a website as a PDF?*
>>>
>>> *I've found most Graphics within Word2004 (and 2001) when the document is
>>> converted to a PDF look fuzzy at best.*
>>>
>>> *John McGhie wrote:*
>>>
>>>> *Sounds like the Windows User has set "Save original picture with document"
>>>> set.*
>>>>
>>>> *When you embed the picture, Word will expand it internally to produce a 96
>>>> dpi screen-resolution version, which it then saves in the document along
>>>> with the original to enable fast display.*
>>>>
>>>> *When it gets to Windows, the Windows machine would blow the thing up into a
>>>> bitmap, and save that with the document too. You would expect a bitmap to
>>>> be 20 times the size, and be compressed by Word to half its original size,
>>>> producing the problem you are seeing.*
>>>>
>>>> *Which is why people suggest that you should avoid using raster graphics for
>>>> letterheads :-) Use a proper EPS and neither platform will fiddle with it.*
>>>>
>>>> *Cheers*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *On 2/11/04 12:52 PM, in article
>>>> e964a4ff.0411011752.6b42ffe3@posting.google.com, "HobeSoundDarryl"
>>>> <DarrylHall@USA.com> wrote:*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> *Hi, I have Mac OS 10.3 and Office 2004. I have created a very simple
>>>>> letterhead template in Word. The file size of it when I'm sending it
>>>>> as a one-page memo is about 90K. The letterhead is an embedded .jpg
>>>>> (though I've also tried .png and .tif). I made the graphics in
>>>>> Macromedia Fireworks, but have tried opening and resaving them in
>>>>> Apple Preview to try to rule out a bug in the paint program. I can
>>>>> send the letterhead to myself and everything works as you would
>>>>> expect. Here's a good description of what's happening...*
>>>>>
>>>>> *I saved the file as a Word Template in Mac Word 2004. Then I opened it
>>>>> as a document and immediately saved it as a Word .doc file. I attached
>>>>> it to an Entourage email message and it attached at a file size of
>>>>> 93K.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *I sent it to a person with Windows XP and the latest version and
>>>>> updates of Office for Windows. He dragged it onto his desktop, opened*

>>>> *it, put in a short "testing" message and saved it as a Word .doc file*
>>>> *again. He sent it back to me through Outlook Express and it arrived at*
>>>> *a filesize of 661K. His "testing" content was just a few chars. I*
>>>> *saved his reply (Word doc) to my (Mac) desktop and then did a "get*
>>>> *info" to check filesize. It was back down to 56K. I opened a new*
>>>> *message and attached it and it attached at 56K.*
>>>>
>>>> *What is going on? Why is the Windows machine blowing the filesize up*
>>>> *approx. 10 times? This problem is consistent time after time.*
>>>> *Originally, I had the graphic at 300dpi, but, on a suggestion from*
>>>> *elsewhere I chopped it down to 150dpi. Smaller filesize out and back,*
>>>> *but still the Windows version sent back to me comes in about 10 times*
>>>> *larger than what I send out.*
>>>>
>>>> *Any additional ideas/suggestions (from anyone) would be appreciated.*
>>>>
>>>>
>>
>

--

Please reply to the newsgroup to maintain the thread. Please do not email me unless I ask you to.

John McGhie <john@mcghie.name>
Consultant Technical Writer
Sydney, Australia +61 4 1209 1410