Related Works Research Paper

Grant Haataja & Seth Thoelke

CSCI 492 - Computer Science Senior Project - Fall 2019

October 17, 2019

Introduction

Creating one's own videos is something many people wish for, but most people quickly get discouraged when attempting to puzzle their way through the complicated software, filled with endless features that mean nothing to them. This is why it is so important to have easy, intuitive online video editing platforms, for everyday untrained people to use to create beautiful videos, as simple or nuanced as they want. The end goal of our project is to create a platform that is elegant and versatile, yet simple and intuitive.

This research paper will investigate a variety of existing online video editing websites and outline their performance while comparing them to our model. The purpose of this is to better inform us of the related services that exist and to overcome the flaws that the existing platforms have.

Related Works

Movie Maker Online [1] is one of the first results that shows upon googling "online video editor". The first thing that is noticeable is a very bare-bones user interface that is not symmetrical and is largely dominated by advertisements. The usage of the website is not the greatest. It's not difficult to figure out, but the buttons don't always make sense or flow nicely. The selection for music is very unfortunate. Once you get into the editing process, the interface becomes overloaded with features that are unimportant to the basic user, like background photo special effects, music cross fade, appearing/disappearing text, font-size, color generators, and much more while finding how to reorder photos and trim the music is quite difficult.

Pros: No account required for creation, and platform is free to use.

Cons: Interface is cluttered with ads, overloaded with less useful features, and difficult to find the critically important parts.

What our web app will do better: No advertisements taking up important space, and focus on the critical video editing features to be as intuitive and useful as possible without overwhelming the user with too many options.

Clipchamp [2] was slower to start evaluating, as it requires users to create an account, and verify it through email. The first thing noted was the fact that Clipchamp only works on Chrome, which is a downside. Once you sign in, it asks you some questions to personalize the experience, which is a good idea. After adding photos and videos to the project, it is not immediately clear how to begin editing, but doesn't take too long to figure out. Clipchamp does not allow you to create videos with higher quality than 480p without upgrading, nor does it allow you to add any music to projects. The most basic account does not allow for 1080p exports, and costs $9 for a month unless you buy an entire year's worth, then it costs $6 per month.

Pros: Easy to match up photos, videos using the mouse.

Cons: The basic version is mostly useless, and using the upgraded version requires a monthly subscription instead of a one-time fee. Interface is a bit clunky and hard to use.

What our web app will do better: Instead of using the "tiers" framework and harassing users to upgrade to a more useful package, our platform will be upfront about what it costs

to buy our service, and hopefully just have a one time fee rather than a monthly subscription. Also, our website will endeavor to be clear and intuitive to make it easy for users to navigate.

Adobe Spark [3] also requires you to have an account to use, but is smoother than Clipchamp because it offers options to login through Google, Facebook, and others besides just email. Google was used to create an account in the test run for this research paper, and the process was straightforward. After getting signed in, the user is prompted to pick one to three categories for which they will use Adobe Spark, for personalization. In making the video, the process is easy to figure out and works well, without too much usage of unnecessary things, but there are a few bugs. Some of the pictures toward the end appeared as if they were copies of the ending video in our test run, although they showed up properly when the slideshow was ran.

Adobe Spark does allow the user to add music to the background, and their selection isn't terrible. They also allow you to add your own music. The free version is fairly useful, but they do add a fairly big watermark to the bottom right of the screen, and flash a screen at the end of the slideshow saying "Made with Adobe Spark". Also, when we tried to see how much upgrading for no adds costed, the website didn't show any plans besides the free version.

Pros: Easy to use, with a clean yet powerful functionality. Can add your own music to the background. Nice selection of themes.

Cons: Video/photo bug, watermark, advertisement at the end. Couldn't figure out how to add multiple photos at once.

What our web app will do better: Make it easier to have multiple photos, have a clearer system for buying the service.

Online Video Cutter [4] has a lot of cool features, but doesn't actually allow for online video editing in a way that is conducive to most users. It allows upload of an existing video, and can trim, crop, rotate, and otherwise edit that video, but cannot create a video show with pictures or anything. It also works for audio files and has features for file extraction and some PDF tools, which are handy.

Pros: Web service has lots of features for editing audio and video files. Does not require an account, and all editing is done online.

Cons: Cannot upload pictures to create any sort of slideshow, or merge more than one video together.

What our web app will do better: Allow for upload of multiple video files and pictures to create a beautiful video show.

Kizoa [5] also didn't start up with Firefox. It gave some instructions for unblocking Flash, but they were not straightforward and would be too confusing for the average computer user. However, on Chrome, the video editing process was very straightforward and yielded an excellent result. Full of nice transitions, special effects, and easy ways to add text, change the slide duration, change background color, and change transition speed, Kizoa was the simplest and best online video editing software so far.

Pros: Easy to use interface, went from nothing to nice video in about 5 minutes. All the necessary features easily accessible in the free version, without smothering the user in unnecessary options. Paid versions are a one time fee instead of recurring memberships.

Cons: User interface is low quality and a little blurry. Free version only allows for videos up to 2 minutes at 780p, while leaving the Kizoa watermark. More basic memberships start at the one-time fee of about $30, but the lower-end ones still only allow for videos at 780p, and have other limitations on video length and account storage.

What our web app will do better: Have a cleaner and more pleasing user interface, and make it so our service hopefully won't cost $100 for the cheapest option to get HD quality for videos.

References

[1] Movie Maker Online (2019). Free video editor & online movie maker. Retrieved from `https://moviemakeronline.com/`

[2] Clipchamp (2019). Free online video editor with pro features, no experience required. Retrieved from `https://clipchamp.com/en/video-editor`

[3] Adobe Spark (2019). Transform your ideas into stunning visual stories. Retrieved from `https://spark.adobe.com/?red=a`

[4] Online Video Cutter (2019). Video Cutter. Retrieved from `https://online-video-cutter.com/`

[5] Kizoa (2019). Online Movie and Video Maker. Retrieved from `https://www.kizoa.com/`