Using DxO RAW I have the option of saving back to LrC in DNG or TIFF, and I can compress as well I believe, which should I use?

For a Lightroom Classic–centric workflow, use DxO's DNG output when you want to keep a "raw-like" file for main tonal/colour work in LrC, and 16-bit TIFF when you've essentially finished in DxO and just need final tweaks or pixel edits in Lightroom/Photoshop.[1][2][3]

How DxO's DNG vs TIFF behave back in LrC

- DxO's DNG export is a *linear* DNG: the raw data has been demosaiced and noise-reduced, but DxO treats this as an intermediate file for further processing in another app, so not all DxO corrections are baked in.[4]
- That means you still do the main developing in Lightroom (exposure, contrast, colour, local adjustments), but starting from a cleaner, denoised "raw-like" file.[5][1]
- TIFF export from DxO is a fully rendered RGB file with your DxO corrections baked in (lens, perspective, colour, etc.), so in LrC you are mostly doing finishing touches, not big tonal surgery.[6][2]

An example pattern many people use is: cull and basic organisation in LrC → send the keepers to PureRAW/PhotoLab → get back linear DNGs → do the creative edit in LrC.[3][1]

When DNG is usually preferable

Use DNG from DxO if:

- You want maximum flexibility in LrC for exposure and white balance changes, because linear DNG still supports raw-style WB adjustments and behaves more like a raw file than a TIFF.[2][3]
- You want to standardise on a single "raw-like" master per image (original camera raw + DxO DNG), keeping TIFFs for only special cases (retouching, layers).[7][1]
- You care about slightly better metadata handling: DNG generally keeps full WB and camera data; some workflows report TIFFs not always carrying WB metadata in a way that behaves as predictably in further edits.[3]

Do note that DxO's DeepPRIME/PRIME DNGs can be significantly larger than the original raws (often several times bigger), so storage impact can be noticeable.[8][5]

When TIFF is the better choice

Pick 16-bit TIFF if:

- You regard DxO as the *primary* image editor and LrC as secondary: in that case you want DxO's rendering baked in, with only subtle tweaks in Lightroom. [2] [8]
- You intend to do heavy pixel-level work, compositing, or round-tripping through Photoshop, where TIFF is the de-facto high-bit, wide-gamut working format. [9] [10] [6]
- You want maximum compatibility with non-Adobe tools now or in future, as TIFF is the most widely supported high-quality RGB format. [10] [6]

A 16-bit TIFF will usually be larger than a camera raw or DNG and is always "final-rendered" RGB, so you lose some of that raw-style latitude (particularly in highlight recovery and WB) compared with staying in raw/linear DNG as long as possible. [9] [6]

About compression choices

- DxO's compressed DNG reduces size but still gives you a linear DNG suitable for LrC editing; it is lossless compression, so you are not throwing away image data. [4] [8]
- TIFF from DxO can also be compressed (e.g. ZIP), which is also lossless but can slow read/write slightly; many people are happy with ZIP-compressed 16-bit TIFF as a good balance of quality and size. [11] [6]

Given your technical level and LrC-first workflow, I'd suggest: default to *compressed linear DNG* from DxO for anything you'll really work on in Lightroom, and reserve *16-bit, ZIP-compressed TIFF* for images that are essentially "finished" in DxO or destined for Photoshop compositing.

Does your typical sequence start with culling and rating in LrC and then sending only selected images to DxO, or are you sometimes starting in DxO and then cataloguing everything in Lightroom afterwards?

⁂

I think the latter; using DxO almost a pre-processor before doing edits in LrC, but possibly occasionally doing a trip to Camera RAW for certain tasks

Given that you're using DxO as a pre-processor and doing the creative work in Lightroom Classic (with the odd trip to Camera Raw), compressed **DNG** is the format that best matches the workflow you're describing; use 16-bit TIFF only for files that need heavy pixel editing or layer work in Photoshop. [16] [17] [18] [19]

Why DNG suits a DxO → LrC → ACR workflow

- DxO PureRAW/PhotoLab are explicitly designed to output *linear DNG* as a "better raw" for downstream editors, so you retain a raw-like workflow in LrC/ACR rather than jumping to a fully baked RGB file. [19] [16]
- The DNG from DxO still behaves much like raw in Lightroom/Camera Raw: you get full access to raw-style white balance, highlight/shadow latitude and masking, but starting from a demosaiced, denoised, lens-corrected base. [20] [16] [19]
- Lightroom Classic and Photoshop's Camera Raw treat DxO's linear DNGs very naturally; you can open them straight into ACR or as smart objects from LrC and keep re-entering ACR for parametric tweaks. [21] [18] [19]

In practice that lets you: cull in LrC → send selected raws to DxO → receive linear DNGs back into the same Lightroom catalog → do global and local edits in LrC, and when needed, open that same DNG into ACR/Photoshop as a smart object for finer work. [22] [23] [18]

Role of compression and file sizes

- DxO's "High Fidelity"/compressed DNG is lossless, just reducing size on disk while preserving all the processed image data and metadata for LrC/ACR. [24] [16]
- Even compressed, linear DNGs will often be 2–4× the size of the original raw, because they store demosaiced data plus DxO's corrections. [25] [26] [19]
- If disk usage starts to bite, your options are: cull hard before sending to DxO, only pre-process frames that really need DeepPRIME, or archive originals and keep DxO DNGs as masters, but I'd avoid switching to TIFF purely for size reasons. [26] [25]

For your use, I'd set DxO's default to *compressed linear DNG* and live with the larger files, using your existing storage/backup discipline to manage volume.

When to step out to TIFF

- TIFF is still the right choice when you know you're heading into Photoshop for substantial pixel-level work (complex retouching, compositing, plug-ins that don't play nicely with smart objects etc.). [18] [27] [28]
- In those cases, export 16-bit TIFF (typically ProPhoto or Adobe RGB) from DxO or from LrC's "Edit in Photoshop" stage and then do your layer-based work there; keep the TIFF alongside the DNG as the "final" master. [28] [18]
- For your occasional ACR trips that are mostly parametric adjustments, you don't need TIFF at all; a DxO DNG opened as a smart object into Photoshop gives you ACR plus the option to add layers without throwing away the raw-style control. [18] [19]

So, day-to-day: DxO → compressed DNG → LrC/ACR as your main path, with TIFF reserved for images that truly need Photoshop-style pixel editing.

Do you currently keep both the original camera raw *and* the DxO-generated file long-term, or are you considering treating the DxO output as your archival master?

⁂

1. https://community.adobe.com/questions-680/edit-in-is-useless-for-dxo-pureraw-as-the-file-changes-to-tiff-907059
2. https://forum.dxo.com/t/export-files-for-lightroom-post-processing-dng-or-tif/6938
3. https://www.facebook.com/groups/1117283422144644/posts/2001350080404636/
4. https://forum.dxo.com/t/export-of-dng-regular-or-compressed-to-lightroom-classic-15-3-not-useful/55027
5. https://forum.dxo.com/t/file-size-of-exported-dng-is-more-than-4x-larger-than-original-raw-file/15732
6. https://community.adobe.com/t5/lightroom-classic-discussions/tif-vs-dng/m-p/12718443
7. https://forum.dxo.com/t/photolab-and-adobe-dng-files-archiving-old-formats/11975
8. https://forum.dxo.com/t/output-file-size/18909
9. https://www.lightroomqueen.com/community/threads/editing-in-raw-vs-tiff-vs-dng-impact-of-external-editors.39897/
10. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZGpFUxtmBM
11. https://community.adobe.com/t5/lightroom-classic-discussions/help-please-dng-and-tiff-file-size/m-p/12073743
12. https://community.adobe.com/t5/lightroom-classic-ideas/p-ai-denoise-output-to-tiff-option-vs-dng/idi-p/13912500
13. https://bcgforums.com/threads/switching-to-dxo-pure-raw-6-from-lightroom-classic-and-or-topaz-photo-ai-v-4-0-4.52926/
14. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbcxe5k0pLE
15. https://userguides.dxo.com/photolab/en/exporting-images/
16. https://www.dxo.com/technology/linear-dng/
17. https://lenscraft.co.uk/photography-blog/dxo-pureraw/
18. https://forum.dxo.com/t/raw-workflow-with-photoshop/29442
19. https://www.photocascadia.com/create-better-raw-files-testing-dxo-pureraw/
20. https://www.facebook.com/groups/1117283422144644/posts/2001350080404636/
21. https://swkrullimaging.com/2022/08/19/dxo-pure-raw-workflow/
22. https://userguides.dxo.com/pureraw/en/workflow-as-a-lightroom-classic-plug-in/
23. https://forum.dxo.com/t/dxo-pure-raw-before-or-after-import-to-lightroom/19113/11
24. https://userguides.dxo.com/pureraw/en/settings/
25. https://forum.dxo.com/t/output-file-size/18909
26. https://forum.dxo.com/t/file-size-of-exported-dng-is-more-than-4x-larger-than-original-raw-file/15732
27. https://www.lightroomqueen.com/community/threads/editing-in-raw-vs-tiff-vs-dng-impact-of-external-editors.39897/
28. https://community.adobe.com/t5/lightroom-classic-discussions/tif-vs-dng/m-p/12718443
29. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tFgc7EYRVRw
30. https://forum.dxo.com/t/pure-raw-as-lr-plugin/32430
31. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbcxe5k0pLE
32. https://forums.negativelabpro.com/t/converting-tiff-to-dng-reasonable/2095
33. https://uk.pcmag.com/photo-editing/132791/dxo-pureraw
34. https://forum.dxo.com/t/comparison-tiff-vs-linear-dng/54551