

---

Subject: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 28 Nov 2007 23:10:07 GMT

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

---

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00B0\_01C831D9.2514E610

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

A Nuendo 4 Mac user recently posted some test results on OSX vs. XP on = the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):

On the Mac he put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage) and EQs on = all channels for up to 32 channels and the cpu was at 90% with stutters and slow GUI response at 1024 sample = buffers. (N4 is now 64-bit for OSX).

On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no glitches = and smooth response. He dropped latency to 512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and playback.

Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing at all - purely a real world = technical comparison. I've always been interested in a head to head of = operating systems. Also take it for what its' worth until more tests = come in.

At the moment, from all of the tests I've seen, it looks like XP can = handle the highest load/cpu utilization of Vista, XP and OSX. No way of knowing where Linux would compare.

Just an interesting fyi. It's not a huge difference, but even at 5-6% = increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista. For some users it may be worth noting - esp. GUI responsiveness - for = others, not a big deal.

I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I figured OSX = and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =20

Regards,  
Dedric

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00B0\_01C831D9.2514E610

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16546" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>A Nuendo 4&nbsp;Mac user recently =
posted some test=20
results on OSX vs. XP on the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):<BR><BR>On =
the Mac he=20
put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage)&nbsp;and EQs on all =
channels for up=20
to 32 channels and</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>the cpu was at 90% with stutters and =
slow GUI=20
response at 1024 sample buffers.&nbsp;(N4 is now 64-bit for=20
OSX).</FONT></DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>
<DIV><BR>On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no =
glitches=20
and smooth response.&nbsp;He dropped latency to</DIV>
<DIV>512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and=20
playback.</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing&nbsp;at all - purely&nbsp;a =
real=20
world technical comparison.&nbsp;I've always been interested in a head =
to head=20
of operating systems.&nbsp;Also take it for what its' worth until more =
tests=20
come in.</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>At the moment, from&nbsp;all of the tests I've seen, it looks like=20
XP&nbsp;can handle the highest load/cpu utilization&nbsp;of Vista, XP =
and=20
OSX.</DIV>
<DIV>No way of knowing where Linux would compare.</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>Just an interesting fyi.&nbsp;It's not a huge difference, but even =
at 5-6%=20
increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista.</DIV>
<DIV>For some users&nbsp;it may be&nbsp;worth noting&nbsp;- esp. GUI=20
responsiveness - for others, not a big deal.</DIV>
<DIV><BR>I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I =
figured OSX=20
and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra</DIV>
```

<DIV>graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps.&nbsp; =  
</FONT></DIV><FONT=20  
face=3DArial size=3D2>  
<DIV><BR>Regards,</DIV>  
<DIV>Dedric<BR></DIV></FONT></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_00B0\_01C831D9.2514E610--

---