Subject: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by emarenot on Sat, 29 Dec 2007 23:54:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
The first post offers this link:
http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1

Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.

Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is interesting
as well.
MR

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by dc[3] on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 00:28:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.

IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
actually works.

DC

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>The first post offers this link:
>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>
>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.

>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is interesting
>as well.

>MR
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by Deej on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 07:41:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me a little of what I heard with tape. Not the saturation aspects wherein tape was spanked hard for a compression effect as much as just the way the tape smoothed off the harshness in the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
Having said that, it's a bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily as tracking to 44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix forward and this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to have that forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 you're mixing to your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and once it is SRC'ed/dithered, it may not end up sounding quite like you thought it would, or at least like what your ears were expecting that it would sound. The internal processing (especially with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at 88.2.

I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting ready to go to a dual boot system (one OS for 44.1 and the other for 88.2 as I had described earlier). In my particular situation, it will just make things make more sense as far as port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've got here is working nicely.

You still liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the nuts?

Deej

"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774051$1@linux...
>
> Dammit, that first part SHOULD have said:
>
> ***First, that was a two-track test, not a MULTI-TRACK test,
> where the difference becomes even more apparent.***
>
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>
>>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>>
>>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,

>>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>>actually works.
>>
>>DC
>>
>>
>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>>>The first post offers this link:
>>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>>>
>>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.
>>>That means there's no audible difference between the original CD standard
>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or 1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The Audio
>>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is
>>>interesting
>>>as well.
>>>MR
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by Neil on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 07:49:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

First, that was a two-track test, not a test, where
the difference becomes even more apparent.

Secondly, how's this: it makes enough of a difference to make
enough of a difference... and that's enough for me.

It's like i've said before, at a certain level, this game is
about incremental improvements, whether it's the incremental
improvement you get from switching from let's say a quite good
midrange mic pre to a really great high-end mic pre, or mic, or
what have you.

Personally, I'm convinced - but don't believe me, or Dan Lavry
or Bob Katz, or Deej - who's now also an 88.2 disciple... try
it for yourself! This is an EASY one you can try for yourself,
too... because it costs you fucking NOTHING to do so, if you
already have a convertor set that'll do that samplerate, and

nowadays most of us do! Track a project from start to finish at
88.2k, i dare ya... you'll never look back. ;)

Neil
88.2k (and NO HIGHER) for life!

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>
>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>actually works.
>
>DC
>
>
>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>>The first post offers this link:
>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>>
>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.

>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is interesting
>>as well.
>>MR
>>
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by Neil on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 07:53:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dammit, that first part SHOULD have said:

***First, that was a two-track test, not a MULTI-TRACK test,
where the difference becomes even more apparent.***

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>
>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>
>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>actually works.
>
>DC
>
>
>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>>The first post offers this link:
>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>>
>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.

>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is interesting
>>as well.
>>MR
>>
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by Neil on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 08:57:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's interesting that you're hearing something akin to what you used to get with tape, because i'm not hearing that at all, and I NEVER used to use 15ips... it was always 30 (for the high end!).

I'm hearing a much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi or my recollections of the days of tape - which for me are 16-18 years ago at the most recent, admittedly.

Neil

"Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:
>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me a little of what I

>heard with tape. Not the saturation aspects wherein tape was spanked hard

>for a compression effect as much as just the way the tape smoothed off the

>harshness in the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>Having said that, it's a bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily as

>tracking to 44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix forward
and
>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to have that
>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 you're mixing
to
>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and once it is SRC'ed/dithered, it
may
>not end up sounding quite like you thought it would, or at least like what

>your ears were expecting that it would sound. The internal processing
>(especially with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at 88.2.
>
>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting ready to go to a dual boot system

>(one OS for 44.1 and the other for 88.2 as I had described earlier). In
my
>particular situation, it will just make things make more sense as far as

>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've got here is

>working nicely.
>
>You still liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the nuts?
>
>Deej
>
>
>
>"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774051$1@linux...
>>
>> Dammit, that first part SHOULD have said:
>>
>> ***First, that was a two-track test, not a MULTI-TRACK test,
>> where the difference becomes even more apparent.***
>>
>>

>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>>>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>>>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>>>
>>>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>>>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>>>actually works.
>>>
>>>DC
>>>
>>>
>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>>>>The first post offers this link:
>>>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>>>>
>>>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.
>>>>That means there's no audible difference between the original CD standard
>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or 1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The Audio
>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is
>>>>interesting
>>>>as well.
>>>>MR
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by dc[3] on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 10:45:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's right. going up to 88.2 or 96, makes an incremental, not
a revolutionary improvement. I'm with you.

Dan Lavry wrote some of the best papers out there on the misconceptions
about digital audio BTW.

http://www.lavryengineering.com/index_html.html

DC

"Neil" <OIUOI@OI.com> wrote:
>
>First, that was a two-track test, not a test, where
>the difference becomes even more apparent.
>
>Secondly, how's this: it makes enough of a difference to make
>enough of a difference... and that's enough for me.
>
>It's like i've said before, at a certain level, this game is
>about incremental improvements, whether it's the incremental
>improvement you get from switching from let's say a quite good
>midrange mic pre to a really great high-end mic pre, or mic, or
>what have you.
>
>Personally, I'm convinced - but don't believe me, or Dan Lavry
>or Bob Katz, or Deej - who's now also an 88.2 disciple... try
>it for yourself! This is an EASY one you can try for yourself,
>too... because it costs you fucking NOTHING to do so, if you
>already have a convertor set that'll do that samplerate, and
>nowadays most of us do! Track a project from start to finish at
>88.2k, i dare ya... you'll never look back. ;)
>
>Neil
>88.2k (and NO HIGHER) for life!
>
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>
>>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>>
>>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>>actually works.
>>
>>DC
>>
>>
>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>>>The first post offers this link:

>>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>>>
>>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.

>>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is interesting
>>>as well.
>>>MR
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by Deej on Sun, 30 Dec 2007 20:59:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_006B_01C84AEC.25008EF0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

We used to use Dolby SR at 15ips. There was this sense of the audio =
content being just sorta' suspended in some kind of soft envelope and no =
tape hiss/extraneous noise. what I hear at 88.2 sorta' reminds me of =
that, and I emphasize the word sorta'. There just seems to be something =
a bit softer and more etherial about the top end, especially on acoustic =
instruments and vocals, and after I've spent the extra time it takes to =
make it sound like a 44.1 kHz CD, it sounds exactly like a CD....LOL!=20

Deej

"Neil" <OUIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774f5e$1@linux...
>=20
> It's interesting that you're hearing something akin to what you
> used to get with tape, because i'm not hearing that at all, and=20
> I NEVER used to use 15ips... it was always 30 (for the high
> end!).
>=20
> I'm hearing a much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi
> or my recollections of the days of tape - which for me are 16-
> 18 years ago at the most recent, admittedly.
>=20
> Neil

>=20
>=20
>=20
> "Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:
>>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me a little of what =
I
>=20
>>heard with tape. Not the saturation aspects wherein tape was spanked =
hard
>=20
>>for a compression effect as much as just the way the tape smoothed off =
the
>=20
>>harshness in the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>>Having said that, it's a bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily =
as
>=20
>>tracking to 44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix =
forward
> and=20
>>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to have that=20
>>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 you're =
mixing
> to=20
>>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and once it is SRC'ed/dithered, =
it
> may=20
>>not end up sounding quite like you thought it would, or at least like =
what
>=20
>>your ears were expecting that it would sound. The internal processing=20
>>(especially with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at 88.2.
>>
>>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting ready to go to a dual boot =
system
>=20
>>(one OS for 44.1 and the other for 88.2 as I had described earlier). =
In
> my=20
>>particular situation, it will just make things make more sense as far =
as
>=20
>>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've got here =
is
>=20
>>working nicely.
>>
>>You still liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the nuts?

>>
>>Deej
>>
>>
>>
>>"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774051$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Dammit, that first part SHOULD have said:
>>>
>>> ***First, that was a two-track test, not a MULTI-TRACK test,
>>> where the difference becomes even more apparent.***
>>>
>>>
>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>>>>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>>>>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>>>>
>>>>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>>>>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>>>>actually works.
>>>>
>>>>DC
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=3D14655
>>>>>The first post offers this link:
>>>>> http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=3D41&blogId=3D 1
>>>>>
>>>>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening =
tests,
>>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player =
undergoes
>>>>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A =
processor.
>>>>>That means there's no audible difference between the original CD =
standard
>>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or 1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The =
Audio
>>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is =

>>>>>interesting
>>>>>as well.
>>>>>MR

>>>>>
>>>>
>>>=20
>>
>>
>
------=_NextPart_000_006B_01C84AEC.25008EF0
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 6.00.6000.16587" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>We used to use Dolby SR at 15ips. There =
was this=20
sense of the audio content being just sorta' suspended in some kind =
of soft=20
envelope and no tape hiss/extraneous noise. what I hear at 88.2 sorta' =
reminds=20
me of that, and I emphasize the word <EM>sorta'.</EM> There just seems =
to be=20
something a bit softer and more etherial about the top end, especially =
on=20
acoustic instruments and vocals, and after I've spent =
the extra=20
time it takes to make it sound like a 44.1 kHz CD, it sounds =
exactly like a=20
CD....LOL! </FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Deej</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2></FONT> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>"Neil" <</FONT><A=20
href=3D"mailto:OUIOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>OUIOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote =
in message=20
</FONT><A href=3D"news:47774f5e$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>news:47774f5e$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>...</FONT></DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>
> It's =
interesting=20
that you're hearing something akin to what you
> used to get with =
tape,=20
because i'm not hearing that at all, and
> I NEVER used to use =

15ips...=20
it was always 30 (for the high
> end!).
>
> I'm =
hearing a=20
much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi
> or my =
recollections of=20
the days of tape - which for me are 16-
> 18 years ago at the most =
recent,=20
admittedly.
>
> Neil
>
>
> =
"Deej"=20
</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:noway@jose.org"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>noway@jose.org</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>=20
wrote:
>>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me =
a little=20
of what I
>
>>heard with tape. Not the saturation =
aspects=20
wherein tape was spanked hard
>
>>for a compression =
effect as=20
much as just the way the tape smoothed off the
> =

>>harshness in=20
the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>>Having said =
that, it's a=20
bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily as
> =

>>tracking to=20
44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix forward
> and=20

>>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to =
have that=20

>>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 =
you're=20
mixing
> to
>>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and =
once it=20
is SRC'ed/dithered, it
> may
>>not end up sounding quite =
like=20
you thought it would, or at least like what
>
>>your =
ears were=20
expecting that it would sound. The internal processing =

>>(especially=20
with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at=20
88.2.
>>
>>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting =
ready to=20
go to a dual boot system
>
>>(one OS for 44.1 and the =
other for=20
88.2 as I had described earlier). In
> my
>>particular=20
situation, it will just make things make more sense as far as
>=20

>>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've =
got=20
here is
>
>>working nicely.
>>
>>You =
still=20
liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the=20

nuts?
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>
>>
=
>>"Neil"=20
<</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:OIOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>OIOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote =
in message=20
</FONT><A href=3D"news:47774051$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>news:47774051$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>...
>>>
>>> Dammit, that first part =
SHOULD have=20
said:
>>>
>>> ***First, that was a two-track =
test, not a=20
MULTI-TRACK test,
>>> where the difference becomes even more =

apparent.***
>>>
>>>
>>> "DC" =
<</FONT><A=20
href=3D"mailto:dc@spammersinhell.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>dc@spammersinhell.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial =
size=3D2>>=20
wrote:
>>>>
>>>>The whole higher bit depth =
and=20
sample rate making way better
>>>>sound is pretty much a=20
myth. It was generated by =
widespread
>>>>misconceptions=20
about "missing information" in digital=20
audio.
>>>>
>>>>IM experience, it makes a =
slight=20
difference, not a major one,
>>>>and this is consistent =
with the=20
facts about how sampling
>>>>actually=20
works.
>>>>
>>>>DC
>>>>
&=
gt;>>>
>>>> "Mike=20
R." <</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:emarenot@yahoo.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>emarenot@yahoo.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>=20
wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>I was checking out =
the=20
Reaper forums and found=20
this:
>>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=
=3D14655
>>>>>The=20
first post offers this=20
link:
>>>>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=3D=
41&blogId=3D1
>>>>>
>>>>>Both=20
links provide information suggesting that in blind listening=20
tests,
>>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a =
high-end=20
SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>>>>no audible change =
when passed=20
through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.
>>>>>That =
means=20

there's no audible difference between the original CD=20
standard
>>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or=20
1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The Audio
>>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, =

2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is=20

>>>>>interesting
>>>>>as=20
well.
>>>>>MR
>>>>>
>>>&g=
t;
>>>=20

>>
>>
></FONT ></BODY></HTML>

------=_NextPart_000_006B_01C84AEC.25008EF0--

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by LaMontt on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 01:50:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Mike and others. I hate discusing this subject because it brings out the mathmeticians, rather than msuicians with ears.

Having said that, I'll stick my neck again and again, and say that :

-Depending on the DAW app you're using, determins how a given 44.1/16bit, 24k, 88.2 etc will sound..

-If you're using the Steinberg products, then Neil is right. The tracks and mix sound better at higher sample rates. I did a test recording using 96k...then recorded back down to 16bit.. The 96k track was "rounder" more defined..

-Aw...But, in Paris, I can't tell the diffence btw tracing in 24bit or 16 bit..

-In Pro Tools, you'll notice a nice "tighter" sound when tracking @96 than in 16 or 24bit..

My finding are non-scientific..Just using my ears, and they are really good. Brian T has been saying that "Software Has a Sound" for years.. I agree..

"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14655
>The first post offers this link:
>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=41&blogId=1
>
>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening tests,
>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.

>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is interesting
>as well.
>MR
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by LaMontt on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 01:56:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yep. I cut my studio teeth on an Otari 90II(24 Track) with Dolby SR..We always cut @ 30ips. That was the sound in 1983.

It's funny. Everybody was trying to get clean as possible. We dreamed of Digital back then..

* Note: When our area got it's first Synclavier (Studio A.Dearborn Mi 1985) We were blow way at how big Digital Sounded. Awwww.. The Synclav sampling rate was 50K. Who said we did not need those extra bits.??

To this day, I have not heard a sampler/converter that sounded as big, clear, wide as that Synclavier. The Kurzweil k250 and Emu's Emax and Even the Fairlight III were a distant second..

So.... What happend? Why have digital sampling/recording taken a step back?? Why haven't we matched or surpassed the sound quality of that 1982/83 technology??

"Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:
>
>
>We used to use Dolby SR at 15ips. There was this sense of the audio =
>content being just sorta' suspended in some kind of soft envelope and no
=
>tape hiss/extraneous noise. what I hear at 88.2 sorta' reminds me of =
>that, and I emphasize the word sorta'. There just seems to be something
=
>a bit softer and more etherial about the top end, especially on acoustic
=
>instruments and vocals, and after I've spent the extra time it takes to
=
>make it sound like a 44.1 kHz CD, it sounds exactly like a CD....LOL!=20
>
>Deej
>

>"Neil" <OUIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774f5e$1@linux...
>>=20
>> It's interesting that you're hearing something akin to what you
>> used to get with tape, because i'm not hearing that at all, and=20
>> I NEVER used to use 15ips... it was always 30 (for the high
>> end!).
>>=20
>> I'm hearing a much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi
>> or my recollections of the days of tape - which for me are 16-
>> 18 years ago at the most recent, admittedly.
>>=20
>> Neil
>>=20
>>=20
>>=20
>> "Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:
>>>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me a little of what
=
>I
>>=20
>>>heard with tape. Not the saturation aspects wherein tape was spanked =
>hard
>>=20
>>>for a compression effect as much as just the way the tape smoothed off
=
>the
>>=20
>>>harshness in the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>>>Having said that, it's a bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily =
>as
>>=20
>>>tracking to 44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix =
>forward
>> and=20
>>>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to have that=20
>>>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 you're =
>mixing
>> to=20
>>>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and once it is SRC'ed/dithered,
=
>it
>> may=20
>>>not end up sounding quite like you thought it would, or at least like
=
>what
>>=20
>>>your ears were expecting that it would sound. The internal processing=20
>>>(especially with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at 88.2.

>>>
>>>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting ready to go to a dual boot
=
>system
>>=20
>>>(one OS for 44.1 and the other for 88.2 as I had described earlier). =
>In
>> my=20
>>>particular situation, it will just make things make more sense as far
=
>as
>>=20
>>>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've got here
=
>is
>>=20
>>>working nicely.
>>>
>>>You still liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the nuts?
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774051$1@linux...
>>>>
>>>> Dammit, that first part SHOULD have said:
>>>>
>>>> ***First, that was a two-track test, not a MULTI-TRACK test,
>>>> where the difference becomes even more apparent.***
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>>>>>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>>>>>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>>>>>
>>>>>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>>>>>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>>>>>actually works.
>>>>>
>>>>>DC
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:

>>>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=3D14655
>>>>>>The first post offers this link:
>>>>>> http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=3D41&blogId=3D 1
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening =
>tests,
>>>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player =
>undergoes
>>>>>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A =
>processor.
>>>>>>That means there's no audible difference between the original CD =
>standard
>>>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or 1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The
=
>Audio
>>>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is
=
>
>>>>>>interesting
>>>>>>as well.
>>>>>>MR
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>=20
>>>
>>>
>>
>
><!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 6.00.6000.16587" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>We used to use Dolby SR at 15ips. There
=
>was this=20

>of soft=20
>envelope and no tape hiss/extraneous noise. what I hear at 88.2 sorta' =
>reminds=20
>me of that, and I emphasize the word <EM>sorta'.</EM> There just seems =
>to be=20
>something a bit softer and more etherial about the top end, especially =
>on=20

>time it takes to make it sound like a 44.1 kHz CD, it sounds =

>CD....LOL! </FONT></DIV>

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Deej</FONT></DIV>

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>"Neil" <</FONT><A=20
>href=3D"mailto:OUIOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>OUIOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote =
>in message=20
></FONT><A href=3D"news:47774f5e$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>news:47774f5e$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>...</FONT></DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>
> It's =
>interesting=20
>that you're hearing something akin to what you
> used to get with =
>tape,=20
>because i'm not hearing that at all, and
> I NEVER used to use =
>15ips...=20
>it was always 30 (for the high
> end!).
>
> I'm =
>hearing a=20
>much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi
> or my =
>recollections of=20
>the days of tape - which for me are 16-
> 18 years ago at the most =
>recent,=20
>admittedly.
>
> Neil
>
>
>
> =
>"Deej"=20
><</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:noway@jose.org"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>noway@jose.org</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>=20
>wrote:
>>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me =
>a little=20
>of what I
>
>>heard with tape. Not the saturation =
>aspects=20
>wherein tape was spanked hard
>
>>for a compression =
>effect as=20
>much as just the way the tape smoothed off the
> =
>
>>harshness in=20
>the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>>Having said =
>that, it's a=20
>bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily as
> =
>
>>tracking to=20
>44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix forward
> and=20
>
>>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to =
>have that=20
>
>>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 =
>you're=20
>mixing
> to
>>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and =
>once it=20

>is SRC'ed/dithered, it
> may
>>not end up sounding quite =
>like=20
>you thought it would, or at least like what
>
>>your =
>ears were=20
>expecting that it would sound. The internal processing =
>
>>(especially=20
>with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at=20
>88.2.
>>
>>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting =
>ready to=20
>go to a dual boot system
>
>>(one OS for 44.1 and the =
>other for=20
>88.2 as I had described earlier). In
> my
>>particular=20
>situation, it will just make things make more sense as far as
>=20
>
>>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've =
>got=20
>here is
>
>>working nicely.
>
>>You =
>still=20
>liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the=20
>nuts?
>
>>Deej
>
>
>
=
>>>"Neil"=20
><</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:OIOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>OIOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote =
>in message=20
></FONT><A href=3D"news:47774051$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>news:47774051$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>...
>>>
>>> Dammit, that first part =
>SHOULD have=20
>said:
>>>
>>> ***First, that was a two-track =
>test, not a=20
>MULTI-TRACK test,
>>> where the difference becomes even more =
>
>apparent.***
>>>
>>>
>>> "DC" =
><</FONT><A=20
>href=3D"mailto:dc@spammersinhell.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>dc@spammersinhell.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial =
>size=3D2>>=20
>wrote:
>>>>
>>>>The whole higher bit depth =
>and=20
>sample rate making way better
>>>>sound is pretty much a=20

>widespread
>>>>misconceptions=20
>about "missing information" in digital=20
>audio.
>>>>
>>>>IM experience, it makes a =
>slight=20
>difference, not a major one,
>>>>and this is consistent =
>with the=20
>facts about how sampling
>>>>actually=20
>works.
>>>>
>>>>DC
>>>>
&=

>gt;>>>
>>>>"Mike=20
>R." <</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:emarenot@yahoo.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>emarenot@yahoo.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>=20
>wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>I was checking out =
>the=20
>Reaper forums and found=20
>this:
>>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=
>=3D14655
>>>>>The=20
>first post offers this=20
>link:
>>>>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=3D=
>41&blogId=3D1
>>>>>
>>>>>Both=20
>links provide information suggesting that in blind listening=20
>tests,
>>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a =
>high-end=20
>SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>>>>no audible change =
>when passed=20
>through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.
>>>>>That =
>means=20
>there's no audible difference between the original CD=20
>standard
>>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or=20
>1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The Audio
>>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, =
>

>
>>>>>interesting
>>>>>as=20
>well.
>>>>>MR
>>>>>
>>>&g=
>t;
>>>=20
>
>>
>>
></FONT></BODY></HTML>
>
>

Subject: Re: 16/44.1 vs 24/96 -maybe not much apparent difference??
Posted by LaMontt on Mon, 31 Dec 2007 01:56:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yep. I cut my studio teeth on an Otari 90II(24 Track) with Dolby SR..We always cut @ 30ips. That was the sound in 1983.

It's funny. Everybody was trying to get clean as possible. We dreamed of Digital back then..

* Note: When our area got it's first Synclavier (Studio A.Dearborn Mi 1985) We were blow way at how big Digital Sounded. Awwww.. The Synclav sampling rate was 50K. Who said we did not need those extra bits.??

To this day, I have not heard a sampler/converter that sounded as big, clear, wide as that Synclavier. The Kurzweil k250 and Emu's Emax and Even the Fairlight III were a distant second..

So.... What happend? Why have digital sampling/recording taken a step back??
Why haven't we matched or surpassed the sound quality of that 1982/83 technology??

"Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:
>
>
>We used to use Dolby SR at 15ips. There was this sense of the audio =
>content being just sorta' suspended in some kind of soft envelope and no
=
>tape hiss/extraneous noise. what I hear at 88.2 sorta' reminds me of =
>that, and I emphasize the word sorta'. There just seems to be something
=
>a bit softer and more etherial about the top end, especially on acoustic
=
>instruments and vocals, and after I've spent the extra time it takes to
=
>make it sound like a 44.1 kHz CD, it sounds exactly like a CD....LOL!=20
>
>Deej
>
>"Neil" <OUIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774f5e$1@linux...
>>=20
>> It's interesting that you're hearing something akin to what you
>> used to get with tape, because i'm not hearing that at all, and=20
>> I NEVER used to use 15ips... it was always 30 (for the high
>> end!).
>>=20
>> I'm hearing a much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi
>> or my recollections of the days of tape - which for me are 16-
>> 18 years ago at the most recent, admittedly.
>>=20
>> Neil
>>=20
>>=20
>>=20
>> "Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:
>>>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me a little of what
=
>I
>>=20
>>>heard with tape. Not the saturation aspects wherein tape was spanked =
>hard
>>=20
>>>for a compression effect as much as just the way the tape smoothed off
=

>the
>>=20
>>>harshness in the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>>>Having said that, it's a bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily =
>as
>>=20
>>>tracking to 44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix =
>forward
>> and=20
>>>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to have that=20
>>>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 you're =
>mixing
>> to=20
>>>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and once it is SRC'ed/dithered,
=
>it
>> may=20
>>>not end up sounding quite like you thought it would, or at least like
=
>what
>>=20
>>>your ears were expecting that it would sound. The internal processing=20
>>>(especially with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at 88.2.
>>>
>>>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting ready to go to a dual boot
=
>system
>>=20
>>>(one OS for 44.1 and the other for 88.2 as I had described earlier). =
>In
>> my=20
>>>particular situation, it will just make things make more sense as far
=
>as
>>=20
>>>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've got here
=
>is
>>=20
>>>working nicely.
>>>
>>>You still liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the nuts?
>>>
>>>Deej
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>"Neil" <OIOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:47774051$1@linux...

>>>>
>>>> Dammit, that first part SHOULD have said:
>>>>
>>>> ***First, that was a two-track test, not a MULTI-TRACK test,
>>>> where the difference becomes even more apparent.***
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>The whole higher bit depth and sample rate making way better
>>>>>sound is pretty much a myth. It was generated by widespread
>>>>>misconceptions about "missing information" in digital audio.
>>>>>
>>>>>IM experience, it makes a slight difference, not a major one,
>>>>>and this is consistent with the facts about how sampling
>>>>>actually works.
>>>>>
>>>>>DC
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"Mike R." <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I was checking out the Reaper forums and found this:
>>>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=3D14655
>>>>>>The first post offers this link:
>>>>>> http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=3D41&blogId=3D 1
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Both links provide information suggesting that in blind listening =
>tests,
>>>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a high-end SACD/DVD-A player =
>undergoes
>>>>>>no audible change when passed through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A =
>processor.
>>>>>>That means there's no audible difference between the original CD =
>standard
>>>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or 1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The
=
>Audio
>>>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, 2007). The discussion that follows on the forum is
=
>
>>>>>>interesting
>>>>>>as well.
>>>>>>MR
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>=20
>>>

>>>
>>
>
><!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 6.00.6000.16587" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>We used to use Dolby SR at 15ips. There
=
>was this=20

>of soft=20
>envelope and no tape hiss/extraneous noise. what I hear at 88.2 sorta' =
>reminds=20
>me of that, and I emphasize the word <EM>sorta'.</EM> There just seems =
>to be=20
>something a bit softer and more etherial about the top end, especially =
>on=20

>time it takes to make it sound like a 44.1 kHz CD, it sounds =

>CD....LOL! </FONT></DIV>

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Deej</FONT></DIV>

><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>"Neil" <</FONT><A=20
>href=3D"mailto:OUIOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>OUIOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote =
>in message=20
></FONT><A href=3D"news:47774f5e$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>news:47774f5e$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>...</FONT></DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>
> It's =
>interesting=20
>that you're hearing something akin to what you
> used to get with =
>tape,=20
>because i'm not hearing that at all, and
> I NEVER used to use =
>15ips...=20
>it was always 30 (for the high
> end!).
>
> I'm =
>hearing a=20
>much clearer high end than either with 44.1 digi
> or my =
>recollections of=20
>the days of tape - which for me are 16-
> 18 years ago at the most =
>recent,=20

>admittedly.
>
> Neil
>
>
>
> =
>"Deej"=20
><</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:noway@jose.org"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>noway@jose.org</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>=20
>wrote:
>>what I'm hearing at 88.2 is a top end that reminds me =
>a little=20
>of what I
>
>>heard with tape. Not the saturation =
>aspects=20
>wherein tape was spanked hard
>
>>for a compression =
>effect as=20
>much as just the way the tape smoothed off the
> =
>
>>harshness in=20
>the 3-5 k range and softened the 12k and up.
>>Having said =
>that, it's a=20
>bit of a struggle to nail the mix as easily as
> =
>
>>tracking to=20
>44.1. 44.1 just seems to push the middle of the mix forward
> and=20
>
>>this is what you hear on CD. At 88.2, getting the mix to =
>have that=20
>
>>forwardness takes a little more doing...it's like at 44.1 =
>you're=20
>mixing
> to
>>your final medium. At 88.2 you're not and =
>once it=20
>is SRC'ed/dithered, it
> may
>>not end up sounding quite =
>like=20
>you thought it would, or at least like what
>
>>your =
>ears were=20
>expecting that it would sound. The internal processing =
>
>>(especially=20
>with the UAD-1 and POCO cards) is a bit superior at=20
>88.2.
>>
>>I'm starting to like 88.2, but I'm getting =
>ready to=20
>go to a dual boot system
>
>>(one OS for 44.1 and the =
>other for=20
>88.2 as I had described earlier). In
> my
>>particular=20
>situation, it will just make things make more sense as far as
>=20
>
>>port naming and improve workflow. In the meantime, what I've =
>got=20
>here is
>
>>working nicely.
>
>>You =
>still=20
>liking the 5042???.....isn't that thing the=20
>nuts?
>
>>Deej
>
>
>
=
>>>"Neil"=20
><</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:OIOIU@OIU.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>OIOIU@OIU.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>> wrote =
>in message=20
></FONT><A href=3D"news:47774051$1@linux"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>news:47774051$1@linux</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial=20

>size=3D2>...
>>>>
>>> Dammit, that first part =
>SHOULD have=20
>said:
>>>>
>>> ***First, that was a two-track =
>test, not a=20
>MULTI-TRACK test,
>>> where the difference becomes even more =
>
>apparent.***
>>>>
>>>>
>>> "DC" =
><</FONT><A=20
>href=3D"mailto:dc@spammersinhell.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>dc@spammersinhell.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial =
>size=3D2>>=20
>wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>The whole higher bit depth =
>and=20
>sample rate making way better
>>>>sound is pretty much a=20

>widespread
>>>>misconceptions=20
>about "missing information" in digital=20
>audio.
>>>>>
>>>>IM experience, it makes a =
>slight=20
>difference, not a major one,
>>>>and this is consistent =
>with the=20
>facts about how sampling
>>>>actually=20
>works.
>>>>>
>>>>DC
>>>>>
&=
>gt;>>
>>>>"Mike=20
>R." <</FONT><A href=3D"mailto:emarenot@yahoo.com"><FONT face=3DArial=20
>size=3D2>emarenot@yahoo.com</FONT></A><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>>=20
>wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>I was checking out =
>the=20
>Reaper forums and found=20
>this:
>>>>>http://www.cockos.com/forum/showthread.php?t=
>=3D14655
>>>>>The=20
>first post offers this=20
>link:
>>>>>http://theaudiocritic.com/blog/index...Id=3D=
>41&blogId=3D1
>>>>>
>>>>>Both=20
>links provide information suggesting that in blind listening=20
>tests,
>>>>>"the two-channel analog output of a =
>high-end=20
>SACD/DVD-A player undergoes
>>>>>no audible change =
>when passed=20
>through a 16-bit/44.1-kHz A/D/A processor.
>>>>>That =
>means=20
>there's no audible difference between the original CD=20
>standard
>>>>>("Red Book") and 24-bit/192-kHz PCM or=20
>1-bit/2.8442-MHz DSD." (The Audio
>>>>>Critic, 17 Oct, =
>

>
>>>>>interesting
>>>>>as=20
>well.
>>>>>MR
>>>>>
>>>&g=

>t;
>>>=20
>
>>
>>
></FONT></BODY></HTML>
>
>