

---

Subject: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [Steve Helm](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 20:31:25 GMT

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

---

Anyone want to revive the old summing debate?  
Check out Digi's In the box vs SSL comparison.

<http://www.digidesign.com/index.cfm?navid=49&langid=100& itemid=25669>

---

---

Subject: Re: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 21:18:08 GMT

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

---

If it wasn't done by Digi... sure. There are several flaws associated with the test, and the mix files are compressed audio so it's difficult to pick out the nuances.

Also this from the front page:

"we did an experiment to see how closely we could match some mixes done on a large-format analog console using Pro Tools and modeled console channel strip plug-ins, and have posted the resulting audio files for you to hear"

This means it isn't an A-B summing thing... the PT mixes were altered to try and "sound like" the SSL mixes... not a direct comparison of ITB vs External Summing.

my \$.02

David.

Steve Helm wrote:

> Anyone want to revive the old summing debate?

> Check out Digi's In the box vs SSL comparison.

>

> <http://www.digidesign.com/index.cfm?navid=49&langid=100& itemid=25669>

---

---

Subject: Re: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 21:22:28 GMT

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

---

"EK Sound" <askme@nospam.com> wrote in message news:46bcd814\$1@linux...

> If it wasn't done by Digi... sure. There are several flaws associated with

> the test, and the mix files are compressed audio so it's difficult to pick

> out the nuances.

Heheh!!!!.....but what difference does it make really, if everyone is listening to compressed audio anyway? Seems the test may be \*more\* valid by offering up files in the final master format.

>  
> Also this from the front page:  
>  
> "we did an experiment to see how closely we could match some mixes done on  
> a large-format analog console using Pro Tools and modeled console channel  
> strip plug-ins, and have posted the resulting audio files for you to hear"  
>  
> This means it isn't an A-B summing thing... the PT mixes were altered to  
> try and "sound like" the SSL mixes... not a direct comparison of ITB vs  
> External Summing.  
>  
> my \$.02  
>  
> David.

Well, I always have a 2 x track of a master mix done in a similar genre that I use as a reference when mixing anyway so this would be sorta' the same thing wouldn't it?.....now just picture Chris Lord Alge using a reference file of a mix done by Roger Nichols and you'll get my drift.

;oD

---

Subject: Re: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 21:43:47 GMT

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

---

Yah, 95% of the public is listening to 3rd or 4th generation rips of high speed written, block errored to death CD's sourced from MP3's created quickly with bad sounding codecs...

Bandwidth? what bandwidth? ;-)

David.

DJ wrote:

> "EK Sound" <askme@nospam.com> wrote in message news:46bcd814\$1@linux...  
>  
>>If it wasn't done by Digi... sure. There are several flaws associated with  
>>the test, and the mix files are compressed audio so it's difficult to pick

>>out the nuances.  
>  
>  
> Heheh!!!!.....but what difference does it make really, if everyone is  
> listening to compressed audio anyway? Seems the test may be \*more\* valid by  
> offering up files in the final master format.  
>  
>  
>  
>>Also this from the front page:  
>>  
>>"we did an experiment to see how closely we could match some mixes done on  
>>a large-format analog console using Pro Tools and modeled console channel  
>>strip plug-ins, and have posted the resulting audio files for you to hear"  
>>  
>>This means it isn't an A-B summing thing... the PT mixes were altered to  
>>try and "sound like" the SSL mixes... not a direct comparison of ITB vs  
>>External Summing.  
>>  
>>my \$.02  
>>  
>>David.  
>  
>  
> Well, I always have a 2 x track of a master mix done in a similar genre that  
> I use as a reference when mixing anyway so this would be sorta' the same  
> thing wouldn't it?.....now just picture Chris Lord Alge using a  
> reference file of a mix done by Roger Nichols and you'll get my drift.  
>  
> ;oD  
>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [wireline\[35\]](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 23:59:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A friend of mine (and DeeJ's) out of Nashville recently released a CD on which 10 of 11 songs were mixed 100% ITB with PTHD...the other one was mixed using schweet outboard and a killer console...

I can't tell which is which, and he ain't talking...

Why bring this up? I don't know...just lonely I guess...that, and when the mix engineer is 100% on game, the differences all become moot...add that to what's already been said about hypercompressing really crappy music to

formats crummier than cassettes, what difference does any of it make?

Jaded but still looking for an alibi,

K

---

---

Subject: Re: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Sat, 11 Aug 2007 00:09:51 GMT

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

---

well without going too deep into the debate, but here are my findings:

any daw including paris improves with a ny mixer (digital or analog)..  
end of story

"Steve Helm" <[shelm@radford.edu](mailto:shelm@radford.edu)> wrote:

>  
> Anyone want to revive the old summing debate?  
> Check out Digi's In the box vs SSL comparison.  
>  
> <http://www.digidesign.com/index.cfm?navid=49&langid=100& amp;itemid=25669>

---

---

Subject: Re: Pro Tools vs. Analog Console Mixing: How sonically different are they?  
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sat, 11 Aug 2007 00:45:10 GMT

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

---

You guys should take the challenge. I got 57% correct. It \*seemed\* to me the PT mixes were a little less wide, but hey look at my score. I only listened to the Chuck Loeb tune. Which totally rocked by the way.

I appreciate the effort and respect them for doing this.

Steve Helm wrote:

> Anyone want to revive the old summing debate?  
> Check out Digi's In the box vs SSL comparison.  
>  
> <http://www.digidesign.com/index.cfm?navid=49&langid=100& amp;itemid=25669>

---