Hi,

I mentioned this problem before in another post and thought I found a decent solution. But it turned out that - in the end - the results using the "3D DVE" effect on video clips overlaying a "background" video track are completely unsatisfactory. This is my (experimental) timeline:

The clip in V1 is an expanded still (JPG, 720x576). The source image has a good quality if displayed in a normal image viewer - so that's not the problem. Now, I use the 3D DVE effect to rotate the resized picture into the visible area, like a photo "falling onto the desk". (Doing this in Premiere usually produces good results.)

As long as the video clip in V2 (the "background") is a normal DV/PAL video, the resulting video shows the resized and rotated photo (clip V1) in a very poor quality: highly aliased, extremely "pixelized" and unsharp. Not usable. (I even checked the quality by creating a DVD and playing it on an LCD TV - just to make sure that I am not seeing some PC related display effect.)

However, as soon as I replace the background clip by a high resolution still image (4000x3000) the quality of the overlay suddenly becomes very much better! It seems that the DVE algorithm somehow relates to the original source resolution of the material in V2! (Although one should think that, once inserted, the clip in V2 has been transcoded to PAL 720x576, anyway!)

I do not quite understand that behaviour - and, for now, the 3D DVE is not usable for me due to the poor quality. Again, I might be missing some vital information, so any hint will be appreciated. Thanks in advance.

Wolf.
Precision

When precision is 10-bit, you get 10-bit YUV output on systems with hardware IO cards. Also, the effects pipeline is 16-bit and uncompressed AVI exports will be 10-bit YUV.

FX Update Interval

When your output is set to an interlaced format, keyframed effects parameters can vary for every field (e.g., 50 times a second for PAL). You can change the fx update interval to override this and have them only change for every frame.

Full SD frames

SD images are 720 pixels wide, but there are only 702 active pixels (with padding on either edge). Turning on 'full SD frames' will cause the whole SD image to appear in viewers, rather than just the active area. This will generally lead to the appearance of black bars on the vertical edges of your images.

Display Optimisation

In interlaced projects Lightworks displays fields in viewers, but you can use this setting to show frames instead.

Re: Quality issues once again!
Posted by WolfR - 10 Feb 2011 19:04

Thanks a lot, Hammerhead!

Re: Quality issues once again!
Posted by WolfR - 13 Feb 2011 22:26
Hammerhead wrote:

Display Optimisation

In interlaced projects Lightworks displays *fields* in viewers, but you can use this setting to show *frames* instead.

If I understand you correctly, the settings (especially *Display Optimisation*) should only affect the viewer display. However, as I still encounter a lot of problems with the quality of my exported video, I did some experimenting. I clearly see a difference in the exported video, as well.

When I export to DV (PAL 4:3) with the optimisation set to *Frames*; the quality of stills and effects is fairly good, but on the other hand the video clips themselves (imported from interlaced DV camera material) are kind of shivery and choppy. If I use *Fields*; however, the result is reversed: stills and effects have a very poor quality (blurred, aliased, pixeled) whereas the video clips seem OK (though not perfect).

It looks as if the *Frames* setting leads to progressive exporting whereas *Fields* creates interlaced material. Can that be correct? If so: what shall I do to get a good quality for all parts of the movie? (I need the export to create a PAL DVD.)

============================================================================

Re: Quality issues once again!
Posted by Cookiecutter - 21 Feb 2011 16:30

WolfR wrote:

Hammerhead wrote:

Display Optimisation

In interlaced projects Lightworks displays *fields* in viewers, but you can use this setting to show *frames* instead.

If I understand you correctly, the settings (especially *Display Optimisation*) should only affect the viewer display. However, as I still encounter a lot of problems with the quality of my exported video, I did some experimenting. I clearly see a difference in the exported video, as well.
When I export to DV (PAL 4:3) with the optimisation set to "Frames" the quality of stills and effects is fairly good, but on the other hand the video clips themselves (imported from interlaced DV camera material) are kind of shivery and choppy. If I use "Fields" however, the result is reversed: stills and effects have a very poor quality (blurred, aliased, pixeled) whereas the video clips seem OK (though not perfect).

It looks as if the "Frames" setting leads to progressive exporting whereas "Fields" creates interlaced material. Can that be correct? If so: what shall I do to get a good quality for all parts of the movie? (I need the export to create a PAL DVD.)

Hi WolfR, Development are aware of a problem during export/render that can cause the problem you have described. This will hopefully be fixed in a later version.
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