Subject: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations
Posted by Neil on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 01:24:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago. Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin & it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs. the other:

1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5 on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!

2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS artifacts than does Auto-Tune.

A couple other observations:

a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically (not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do it at all).

b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track - someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits, you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -

- get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge" and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:
1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK, leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.

Final Tip:
When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.

Anyway, just some observations.

Neil

Subject: Re: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations
Posted by Bill L on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 01:50:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There is a Melodyne-like feature in Samplitude 8 that works pretty darn well too, aside from a few idiosyncrasies.

Neil wrote:
> I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-
> something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-
> whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago.
> Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a
> vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get
> out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned
> vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin &

> it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a
> couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having
> done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs.
> the other:
>
> 1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5
> on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can
> tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the
> signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY
> CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic
> kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction
> would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound
> a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not
> severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by
> the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did
> not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can
> sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch
> correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in
> the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!
>
> 2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is
> the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS
> artifacts than does Auto-Tune.
>
> A couple other observations:
>
> a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically
> (not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do
> it at all).
>
> b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune
> does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track -
> someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not
> make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a
> typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits,
> you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're
> tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -
> - get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge"
> and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn
> Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of
> noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know
> how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a
> breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you
> to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that
> Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:
> 1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch
> on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those
> artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note

> right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's
> place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you
> obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice
> it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
> I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to
> option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK,
> leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.
>
> Final Tip:
> When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to
> a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or
> folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting
> the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the
> project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.
>
> Anyway, just some observations.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations
Posted by LaMont on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 02:49:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Neil..Thanks for the tips..

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>
>I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-
>something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-
>whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago.
>Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a
>vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get
>out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned
>vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin &
>it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a
>couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having
>done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs.
>the other:
>
>1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5
>on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can
>tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the
>signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY
>CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic
>kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction
>would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound
>a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not

>severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by
>the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did
>not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can
>sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch
>correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in
>the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!
>
>2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is
>the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS
>artifacts than does Auto-Tune.
>
>A couple other observations:
>
>a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically
>(not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do
>it at all).
>
>b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune
>does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track -
>someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not
>make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a
>typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits,
>you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're
>tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -
>- get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge"
>and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn
>Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of
>noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know
>how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a
>breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you
>to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that
>Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:
>1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch
>on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those
>artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note
>right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's
>place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you
>obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice
>it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
>I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to
>option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK,
>leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.
>
>Final Tip:
>When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to
>a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or
>folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting
>the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the

>project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.
>
>Anyway, just some observations.
>
>Neil

Subject: Re: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations
Posted by DJ on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 03:03:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good info Neil. I was looking hard at Melodyne, but from your analysis here, I think Autotune5 would more closely fit my needs. thanks. You probaby just saved me a couple of C notes.

;o)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a16061@linux...
>
> I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-
> something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-
> whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago.
> Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a
> vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get
> out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned
> vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin &
> it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a
> couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having
> done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs.
> the other:
>
> 1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5
> on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can
> tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the
> signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY
> CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic
> kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction
> would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound
> a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not
> severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by
> the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did
> not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can
> sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch
> correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in
> the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!
>
> 2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is
> the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS

> artifacts than does Auto-Tune.
>
> A couple other observations:
>
> a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically
> (not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do
> it at all).
>
> b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune
> does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track -
> someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not
> make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a
> typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits,
> you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're
> tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -
> - get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge"
> and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn
> Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of
> noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know
> how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a
> breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you
> to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that
> Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:
> 1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch
> on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those
> artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note
> right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's
> place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you
> obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice
> it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
> I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to
> option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK,
> leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.
>
> Final Tip:
> When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to
> a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or
> folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting
> the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the
> project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.
>
> Anyway, just some observations.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations

Posted by Neil on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 03:39:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, it wouldn't hurt to check out both if you can. I'm not
saying one's necessarily better than the other all-around, but
rather that it more or less kinda depends on the application.
At least in my view.

I'm kinda glad I have both, to be quite honest. I'm doing
a jingle tomorrow where I'll be tracking a female singer that I
used a gentle Auto-Tune setting on before & it worked great,
but in this particular case I envision having to use Melodyne
because I think the key of this jingle is right at the very top
of her range... hence possibly needing more pitch correction on
a few notes, like when she has to hit it high with power (and we
all know this usally means singers going flat near the upper
envelopes of their ranges). So again, glad I have both options.

Neil

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>Good info Neil. I was looking hard at Melodyne, but from your analysis here,

>I think Autotune5 would more closely fit my needs. thanks. You probaby just

>saved me a couple of C notes.
>
>;o)
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a16061@linux...
>>
>> I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-
>> something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-
>> whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago.
>> Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a
>> vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get
>> out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned
>> vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin &
>> it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a
>> couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having
>> done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs.
>> the other:
>>
>> 1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5
>> on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can
>> tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the
>> signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY
>> CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic

>> kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction
>> would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound
>> a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not
>> severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by
>> the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did
>> not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can
>> sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch
>> correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in
>> the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!
>>
>> 2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is
>> the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS
>> artifacts than does Auto-Tune.
>>
>> A couple other observations:
>>
>> a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically
>> (not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do
>> it at all).
>>
>> b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune
>> does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track -
>> someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not
>> make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a
>> typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits,
>> you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're
>> tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -
>> - get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge"
>> and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn
>> Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of
>> noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know
>> how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a
>> breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you
>> to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that
>> Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:
>> 1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch
>> on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those
>> artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note
>> right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's
>> place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you
>> obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice
>> it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
>> I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to
>> option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK,
>> leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.
>>
>> Final Tip:
>> When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to

>> a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or
>> folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting
>> the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the
>> project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.
>>
>> Anyway, just some observations.
>>
>> Neil
>
>

Subject: Re: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations
Posted by Neil on Sat, 21 Jul 2007 04:08:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

No prob. You're quite welcome.

Neil

"LaMOnt" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>
>Hey Neil..Thanks for the tips..
>
>"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>
>>I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-
>>something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-
>>whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago.
>>Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a
>>vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get
>>out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned
>>vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin &
>>it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a
>>couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having
>>done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs.
>>the other:
>>
>>1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5
>>on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can
>>tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the
>>signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY
>>CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic
>>kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction
>>would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound
>>a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not
>>severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by

>>the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did
>>not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can
>>sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch
>>correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in
>>the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!
>>
>>2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is
>>the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS
>>artifacts than does Auto-Tune.
>>
>>A couple other observations:
>>
>>a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically
>>(not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do
>>it at all).
>>
>>b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune
>>does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track -
>>someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not
>>make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a
>>typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits,
>>you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're
>>tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -
>>- get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge"
>>and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn
>>Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of
>>noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know
>>how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a
>>breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you
>>to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that
>>Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:
>>1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch
>>on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those
>>artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note
>>right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's
>>place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you
>>obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice
>>it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
>>I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to
>>option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK,
>>leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.
>>
>>Final Tip:
>>When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to
>>a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or
>>folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting
>>the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the
>>project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.

>>
>>Anyway, just some observations.
>>
>>Neil
>

Subject: Re: Auto-Tune vs. Melodyne - some observations
Posted by Bill L on Sun, 22 Jul 2007 14:32:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Neil, although I have not used Mel, the one in Sam is similar and I
agree the graphic type and the auto type both have their places and are
not interchangeable.

Neil wrote:
> Well, it wouldn't hurt to check out both if you can. I'm not
> saying one's necessarily better than the other all-around, but
> rather that it more or less kinda depends on the application.
> At least in my view.
>
> I'm kinda glad I have both, to be quite honest. I'm doing
> a jingle tomorrow where I'll be tracking a female singer that I
> used a gentle Auto-Tune setting on before & it worked great,
> but in this particular case I envision having to use Melodyne
> because I think the key of this jingle is right at the very top
> of her range... hence possibly needing more pitch correction on
> a few notes, like when she has to hit it high with power (and we
> all know this usally means singers going flat near the upper
> envelopes of their ranges). So again, glad I have both options.
>
> Neil
>
>
> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>> Good info Neil. I was looking hard at Melodyne, but from your analysis here,
>
>> I think Autotune5 would more closely fit my needs. thanks. You probaby just
>
>> saved me a couple of C notes.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>> "Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:46a16061@linux...
>>> I've used Auto-Tune for some time now - still have V1-point-
>>> something on Floppy disks, in fact; and now am on v5-point-
>>> whatever, but hadn't tried Melodyne until a few months ago.
>>> Had the occasion recently to do a good deal of work on a

>>> vocalist who needed a bit more correction than what I could get
>>> out of A-T without it really sounding like an Auto-Tuned
>>> vocal... if you know what I mean. Tried the Melodyne Plugin &
>>> it was the ticket in this particular case. I know we've had a
>>> couple of threads on this topic over time, so, based on having
>>> done a few songs with it now, I now offer up my take on one vs.
>>> the other:
>>>
>>> 1.) If you need a little bit of gentle correction, Auto-Tune 5
>>> on autopilot is definitely the way to go - from what I can
>>> tell, A-T passes more of the unadulterated qualities of the
>>> signal through, while Melodyne EVEN IF YOU DON'T APPLY ANY
>>> CHANGES TO THE NOTE will sound altered - it's not a harmonic
>>> kind of alteration like AutoTune doing a severe correction
>>> would display, but it's almost as if it "rounds out" the sound
>>> a bit... maybe takes a bit of the edge or air off. It's not
>>> severe, but it's noticeable. AT5 sounds really fucking good, by
>>> the way, and has a couple of features that previous versions did
>>> not, such as "Humanize", which, when used in gentle degrees can
>>> sound good, and an option where you can set the pitch
>>> correction to ignore vibrato - something that's VERY useful in
>>> the case of any singers who have a wide vibrato!
>>>
>>> 2.) If you need more serious pitch correction, then Melodyne is
>>> the way to go - in this type of application it displays LESS
>>> artifacts than does Auto-Tune.
>>>
>>> A couple other observations:
>>>
>>> a.) Melodyne can also adjust/alter timing, ether automatically
>>> (not recommended, IME) or manually (better - if you need to do
>>> it at all).
>>>
>>> b.) Melodyne does not handle "noise" as well as Auto-Tune
>>> does... for example, if you have a nice, clean vocal track -
>>> someone singing softly through a clean mic & preamp, it may not
>>> make much of a difference; but if you have someone singing a
>>> typical rock, country rock, or if you're recording Tom Waits,
>>> you may have some problems with Melodyne... especially if you're
>>> tracking Tom Waits through a u-67 & a nice woolly Neve preamp -
>>> - get my drift? Let's say Tom sings the phrase: "Baton Rouge"
>>> and phonetically it sounds something like: "Brhaagghtnn
>>> Hrooozzgzzzh", then you, my friend, are going to have a lot of
>>> noise/non-note kind of artifacts that Melodyne will not know
>>> how to deal with. This includes breaths, by the way, so a
>>> breathy female vocal may also give you fits. It'll be up to you
>>> to do one of two things with those short bursts of noise that
>>> Melodyne will be incapable of recognizing as notes:

>>> 1.) Leave 'em where they are & don't try to correct the pitch
>>> on 'em & just hope it works.. or: 2.) manually edit those
>>> artifacts out of the Melodyne display screen & extend the note
>>> right in front of or right behind were it was to take it's
>>> place. If you haven't worked with Melodyne yet, then you
>>> obviously don't know exactly what I mean by that, but suffice
>>> it to say this can be laborious on some singers & genres.
>>> I would suggest trying "1" before automatically jumping to
>>> option # "2" - you may find that some of the noise bits are OK,
>>> leaving you only to have to manually tweak the remainder.
>>>
>>> Final Tip:
>>> When using Melodyne, ALWAYS make sure to set the record path to
>>> a new subfolder you can create within the project directory or
>>> folder tree - don't use the default. In this manner (setting
>>> the record path yourself), the Melodyne files aways go with the
>>> project, even when you back it up, archive it, etc.
>>>
>>> Anyway, just some observations.
>>>
>>> Neil
>>
>