
Subject: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_) [OBSOLETE]

Posted by [qwerty](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 19:56:32 GMT

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

...

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Wed, 24 May 2006 23:17:13 GMT

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

qwerty wrote on Wed, 24 May 2006 20:56...if the admins has nothing against it :>

...If you want these forums to be shut down in the nearest future...

The free space left is 200MB (from 400MB). Your screenshot is 0.5MB. Count yourself. But even the bigger problem is that the search engines spiders eat bandwidth by indexing them on a regular basis. At the moment I blocked them until I resolve that picture indexing problem. So, at least try to make smaller *.png ...

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [qwerty](#) on Thu, 25 May 2006 06:17:35 GMT

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

oh, I apologize

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 01:59:03 GMT

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

qwerty wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 07:17oh, I apologize

No, no need to apologize. You can post screenshots but I just think *.png format is much more compact than *.jpg for them.

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 04:44:18 GMT

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

fudadmin wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:59qwerty wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 07:17oh, I apologize

No, no need to apologize. You can post screenshots but I just think *.png format is much more compact than *.jpg for them.

Incorrect...

Mirek

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 06:48:04 GMT

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

luzr wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 05:44fudadmin wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:59qwerty wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 07:17oh, I apologize

No, no need to apologize. You can post screenshots but I just think *.png format is much more compact than *.jpg for them.

Incorrect...

Mirek

Then share your knowledge and tell how to make my screenshot smaller *.jpp...

<http://www.arilect.com/upp/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=1002> &start=0&

Edit: Without losing quality.

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 07:51:30 GMT

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

fudadmin wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 02:48luzr wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 05:44fudadmin wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 21:59qwerty wrote on Thu, 25 May 2006 07:17oh, I apologize

No, no need to apologize. You can post screenshots but I just think *.png format is much more compact than *.jpg for them.

Incorrect...

Mirek

Then share your knowledge and tell how to make my screenshot smaller *.jpp...

<http://www.arilect.com/upp/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=1002> &start=0&

Edit: Without losing quality.

.jpg (what is .jpp?) is always losing quality. That is why it produces smaller files... whereas .png is lossless format, and even not very good one (it internally uses zlib to compress scanlines of image, not very effective...).

.jpg of real-world picture will always be order of magnitude shorter than .png (real world pictures do not compress well using zlib).

For screenshots, this may or might not be true - usually you can get order of magnitude shorter .jpg, but with visible degradation. In this particular case, .jpg is way better, because there is a lot of color transitions and real-world picture background.

Mirek

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 07:59:34 GMT

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

That means, anyway, for the same quality png is smaller, especially screenshots... Or can you demonstrate otherwise with my screenshot?

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:08:41 GMT

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

fudadmin wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 03:59 That means, anyway, for the same quality png is smaller, especially screenshots... Or can you demonstrate otherwise with my screenshot?

Yes, that is by definition.

However, to conserve forum space, you should rather recommend using low-quality .jpg - they would still be good enough to provide the information, but 3-4 times shorter.

Mirek

File Attachments

1) [test.jpg](#), downloaded 1634 times

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:19:03 GMT

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

To provide information, yes -low quality jpg IS smaller. But the topic was that people want to demonstrate the beauty of their workspaces... That's why I said *.png...

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:23:16 GMT

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

fudadmin wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 04:19To provide information, yes -low quality jpg IS smaller. But the topic was that people want to demonstrate the beauty of their workspaces... That's why I said *.png...

1) .png would still be bigger for indistiguishable quality

2) I believe that the right way to demonstrate beauty of the workspace is to upload it somewhere else (in whatever format) and post just link.

Mirek

File Attachments

1) [test.jpg](#), downloaded 1620 times

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)[OBSOLETE]

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:24:52 GMT

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

(I will delete them ASAP):

File Attachments

1) [test.png](#), downloaded 1617 times

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:35:25 GMT

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

luzr wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 09:23fudadmin wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 04:19To provide information, yes -low quality jpg IS smaller. But the topic was that people want to demonstrate the beauty of their workspaces... That's why I said *.png...

1) .png would still be bigger for indistiguishable quality

2) I believe that the right way to demonstrate beauty of the workspace is to upload it somewhere else (in whatever format) and post just link.

Mirek

Then the problem is with U++ icons!
Try to make 50.4kb *.png screenshot smaller *.jpg...

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:45:22 GMT

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

In this case, .png is made shorter because there are very big areas of single color (white, light-gray). Those compress well with zlib.

However, still considering now deleted screenshot that started this discussion, that one WOULD be shorter using .jpg.

Anyway, I guess we could agree: to show us how many nice backgrounds you have in your XP desktop, upload elsewhere and post link. For screenshots dealing with actual problems, use either .png or .jpg, what fits better. Use as much compression as possible.

Mirek

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 08:52:27 GMT

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

luzr wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 09:45 In this case, .png is made shorter because there are very big areas of single color (white, light-gray). Those compress well with zlib.

However, still considering now deleted screenshot that started this discussion, that one WOULD be shorter using .jpg.

Anyway, I guess we could agree: to show us how many nice backgrounds you have in your XP desktop, upload elsewhere and post link. For screenshots dealing with actual problems, use either .png or .jpg, what fits better. Use as much compression as possible.

Mirek

Agree, but I expected that people would post screenshots with a lot of single color...

Subject: Re: post there a screenshot of your upp workspace :_)

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 26 May 2006 09:11:31 GMT

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

fudadmin wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 04:52luzr wrote on Fri, 26 May 2006 09:45In this case, .png is made shorter because there are very big areas of single color (white, light-gray). Those compress well with zlib.

However, still considering now deleted screenshot that started this discussion, that one WOULD be shorter using .jpg.

Anyway, I guess we could agree: to show us how many nice backgrounds you have in your XP desktop, upload elsewhere and post link. For screenshots dealing with actual problems, use either .png or .jpg, what fits better. Use as much compression as possible.

Mirek

Agree, but I expected that people would post screenshots with a lot of single color...

Well, for some reason, some people consider desktop with a lot of single color not beautiful enough

Mirek
