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1. What scheme or schemes did you try? If you came up your own idea, describe it here.

I tried the prior value scheme after attempting the average neighbor method. Temporal coherence seemed like it could work better and make more sense but that guess did not work out better than prior value.

2.Why do you think your scheme would do a good job predicting pixel values? How does your scheme exploit temporal and/or spatial coherence?

M scheme would do a good job of predicting pixel values because it considers the spatial coherence that is formed when the frames move in a video and make it look like it is a clean motion. In my attempted scheme I attempted to use a method in which an index would use previous intensity values and use those same values in the prediction model.

3.When applying the English text-based models (static, adaptive, and context-adaptive) to the video data, which scheme performed best? Does the scheme you developed compress better or worse than the English text-based models when applied to video data? If you weren't able to finish and test your own scheme, how do you think your scheme would fare in comparison to the English text-based models?

-Of the English text based models, the static test had 1064024 bytes, adaptive test had 1063224 bytes, and the Context Adaptive test had 909144 bytes

-The prior value context adaptive that I developed compresses at the same rate, not better or worse than the English text based adaptive test (1063224 bytes)

4.What is one change you could make to your scheme that might improve its results?

I would try to make my algorithm more efficient by focusing on maybe how a different scheme could exploit temporal/special coherence. Additionally, when it comes to compression, run time is important and key in deciding which one is better/more efficient. That being said, I would also try to improve my run time as the current run time is O(n2)