

Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.moviemaker/2005-08/msg01007.html>

- *From:* "Rehan" <someone@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 17 Aug 2005 04:58:58 +0100
-

It seems that your being right about the blurring filter in DV AVI has made you blind with arrogance.... so much so that now you seem to be claiming completely unrelated parts of the argument to be settled in your favor.

> Some people just insist on being wrong, and there's nothing I can do about
> it, but challenge them. So tell us how it is that image resizing and/or
> changing pixel aspect ratio is different for "DV-AVI (NTSC)" and "High
> Quality Video (NTSC)". They are both 720x480 are they not? Therefore
> does the image not have to be resized the same for both? And just for the
> sake of argument, assuming a change of pixel aspect ratio, would this not
> be done for both formats too since they are both 720x480?

The major difference in quality between "DV-AVI (NTSC)" and "High Quality Video (NTSC)" is due to the blurring filter. I accept, and as before, give you credit for suspecting it... so far so good...

However this does not disprove the existence of a quality degradation due to non-square pixel adjustment....

Proof? Explain the difference between the "High Quality Video (NTSC)" and "High Quality Video (large)" !!!

The difference between these two profile is that NTSC one saves in 720x480 using non-square pixels... while the other one saves in 640x480 using square pixels. The latter profile is clearly much sharper (try it with my test images, particularly B). If non-square pixels do no cause any effect then such a difference should not exist.

—
Rehan
MS MVP — Digital Media
www.rehanfx.org – get transitions and effects for Windows Movie Maker

"Al Stu – MVP" <NOYB@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures

news:OFFaFSGoFHA.3108@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

>I don't think that's quite what he said, but you are entitled to your
>misconceived interpretation. Just don't spread it around.

>

>

>

> Some people just insist on being wrong, and there's nothing I can do about
> it, but challenge them. So tell us how it is that image resizing and/or
> changing pixel aspect ratio is different for "DV-AVI (NTSC)" and "High
> Quality Video (NTSC)". They are both 720x480 are they not? Therefore
> does the image not have to be resized the same for both? And just for the
> sake of argument, assuming a change of pixel aspect ratio, would this not
> be done for both formats too since they are both 720x480?

>

>

>

> I am not, and never have questioned that down-resizing the pixel count of
> an image will not have an impact on it's quality. That is a given
> regardless of tool used. But it has to do that regardless of saving as
> "DV-AVI (NTSC)" vs. "High Quality Video (NTSC)" as they are both 720x480.

>

>

>

> Based on my limited understanding of digitized images, it does not seem
> that changing pixel aspect ratio will change the quality of an image.
> Just it's H/V proportionality.

>

>

>

> I will admit I am not a video/image expert and my positions, premises, and
> reasoning at times may not be totally complete and 100% accurate, and
> perhaps sometimes just plain ol' flawed. But what you are trying to put
> forth just does not make technical sense to me. Furthermore you still
> have not shown any evidence of DV-AVI non-square pixel specification. If
> you can adequately build your case to prove, then I will subscribe, but so
> far you have not been able to do that. Who knows I could still wind up
> with egg on face, but so far it doesn't look that way.

>

>

>

>---

>

> Al Stu - MVP

> The world may be round, but I'm still living on the edge.

>

> Copyright © 2005, Al Stu (2348410). All Rights Reserved.

>

>

>

> "Rehan" <someone@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> news:%2359AgyDoFHA.2180@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures

>> Hi Al,
>>
>> I appreciate your challenges and consider them part of a healthy
>> discussion. I give you full credit for suspecting that something
>> more/other was going on. However I object to your use of word like
>> "misconceived notion" etc as it is not fair. It has been confirmed by
>> Dean that my explanation of non-square resampling also plays a part in
>> the degraded output of DV AVI although it may not be as significant as
>> the contribution from the filter. Therefore I would request that you keep
>> to the truth as it is. Distorting the arguments just to please somebody's
>> ego is not fair at all.
>>
>> --
>> Rehan
>> MS MVP -- Digital Media
>> www.rehanfx.org - get transitions and effects for Windows Movie Maker
>>
>>
>>
>> "Al Stu - MVP" <NOYB@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:e9nu2NDofHA.2080@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>> Yup, My challenging Rehan's misconceived notions was not helpful at all.
>>> LOL
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)
 ◇ From: Al Stu - MVP

• *References:*

- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)
 ◇ From: Dean Rowe [MS]
- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)
 ◇ From: PapaJohn \ (MVP\)
- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)
 ◇ From: John Kelly
- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)
 ◇ From: Al Stu - MVP
- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)
 ◇ From: Rehan
- ◆ [Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures](#)

Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures

◇ *From: Al Stu – MVP*

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures***
- Next by Date: ***Re: I can play/rewind etc but not view***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Fuzzy Still Pictures***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***