Subject: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by Dedric Terry on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 02:39:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum that is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay, worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but that part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this there.

So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo 3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks, just to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8 Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found, and what I would like to confirm with other users:

At 64 sample latency:
DAW # JCM900s
Nuendo 15
Samplitude 38

(X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)

Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features, etc, etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles it's own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent of ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At 128, Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot" for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in what sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be consistent on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't missing something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was at 2048).

Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all I could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding more - over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose a little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).

The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run with

"Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking up - given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but something about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is slow to reset the audio engine.

I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?

The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause a flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.

Thanks!
Dedric

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by audioguy_editout_ on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 05:57:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I can do some NU3 tests for you tomorrow if you like.

David.

Dedric Terry wrote:
> Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
> experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum that
> is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
> worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but that
> part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
> there.
>
> So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
> 3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
> full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks, just
> to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
> Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
> and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>
> At 64 sample latency:
> DAW   # JCM900s
> Nuendo   15
> Samplitude 38
>

> (X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>
> Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
> at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
> warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features, etc,
> etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles it's
> own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent of
> ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At 128,
> Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
> for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in what
> sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be consistent
> on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be
> an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't missing
> something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was at
> 2048).
>
> Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all I
> could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding more
> - over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
> higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
> in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
> to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose a
> little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>
> The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run with
> "Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
> run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking up
> - given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but something
> about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a
> single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
> lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
> slow to reset the audio engine.
>
> I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
> about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
> right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>
> The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause a
> flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
> manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>
> Thanks!
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users

Thanks David! What audio card(s) do you have? What are your system specs?

The test is pretty basic, but will give me an idea of comparative driver performance - just an sine wave (100Hz will do) stereo audio track; copied to 96 tracks; loop about 10 seconds or so of it at zero crossings.

Put JMC900 in all 8 inserts of a track and copy that to another 2 tracks, with all plugins disabled. Run at 64 samples with "Low Latency" off in expert audio settings and enable plugins until Nuendo starts sputtering or crackling. Record the count when it can loop over a 10 second or so segment 4-5 times without sputtering. Repeat at 128, 256 and 512 sample latency. Also try a run at 64 with "Adjust for Record Latency" off, and the Constrain PDC button on, just for curiosity - probably won't make any difference (the first setting shouldn't at least).

The ideal scenario is to compare Nuendo to Samplitude on each system, but if you don't have time to load the Sam8.11 demo, or if you don't have it, no problem. Different systems will perform differently, so comparing systems isn't of as much value as comparing an audio driver on a single system between N3.2 and Samplitude 8 using the same plugins, audio files, and ASIO driver latency. I'm going to load the Sonar 5 demo tomorrow and give it a try too.

Thanks!
Dedric

On 4/6/06 11:57 PM, in article 44360119@linux, "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:

> I can do some NU3 tests for you tomorrow if you like.
>
> David.
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>> Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>> experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum that
>> is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>> worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but that
>> part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>> there.
>>
>> So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>> 3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>> full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks, just
>> to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
>> Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,

>> and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>>
>> At 64 sample latency:
>> DAW # JCM900s
>> Nuendo 15
>> Samplitude 38
>>
>> (X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>>
>> Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
>> at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>> warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features, etc,
>> etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles it's
>> own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent of
>> ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At 128,
>> Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
>> for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in what
>> sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be consistent
>> on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be
>> an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't missing
>> something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was at
>> 2048).
>>
>> Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all I
>> could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding more
>> - over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>> higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>> in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
>> to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose a
>> little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>>
>> The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run with
>> "Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>> run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking up
>> - given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but something
>> about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a
>> single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
>> lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
>> slow to reset the audio engine.
>>
>> I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
>> about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>> right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>>
>> The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause a
>> flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>> manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>>

>> Thanks!
>> Dedric
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 14:39:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Dedric,

Well it seems that you've finally came to point where I've been stating for
a while. I'm not as scientific as you are, I'm more of the "i don't why,
but this is the way it it" :)

I'll go further, being an early adopter to the Nuendo platform(version 1.1)I
would say that Nuendo 1.5 (too me) was the sleekest, best sounding version
to come along..

My uneducated guess as to why Neundo 3.x is not as effiecient as Samplitude,
is due to the following:

-Summing mixer Algorithm(32 bit float)-after 40 tracks, with plugins things
starts getting weird soundwise.

-Warp engine..It has always hindered Acid's sound quality, why not Neundo's?

-Vst performance: right now with the way that Pace is integrated in the application,
I must say that running the "crack yields way better results in work flow..
LaMont

-

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum that
>is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but that
>part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>there.
>
>So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks,
just
>to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
>Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
>and what I would like to confirm with other users:

>
>At 64 sample latency:
>DAW # JCM900s
>Nuendo 15
>Samplitude 38
>
>(X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>
>Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
>at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features, etc,
>etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles it's
>own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent
of
>ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At 128,
>Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
>for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in what
>sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be consistent
>on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to
be
>an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't missing
>something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was
at
>2048).
>
>Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all
I
>could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding
more
>- over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
>to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose
a
>little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>
>The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run with
>"Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking
up
>- given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but something
>about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add
a
>single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
>lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
>slow to reset the audio engine.
>
>I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had

>about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>
>The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause
a
>flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>
>Thanks!
>Dedric
>

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by Dedric Terry on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 17:10:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey Lamont,

My investigation isn't really about sound quality as much as performance,
but if I can get midi/VSTi and score to picture capabilities in Samplitude
and it sounds better, I wouldn't mind switching.

The point really is that Nuendo isn't performing as I would expect, esp. at
low latency. Some Nuendo users think RME drivers are to blame, but my
Samplitude tests tell me otherwise.

As far as the summing engine - both are 32-bit float all the way through,
and that shouldn't have any affect on performance. I'll reserve judgement
on the differences and whether that affects sound until I can test it out.
Believe me, I'm not opposed to getting a better sounding app, but there is a
lot to give up compared to Nuendo for scoring and composing - a lot (tempo
map/warp - Samplitude isn't even in the ballpark here; only one controller
draw tool in Sam - freehand; etc).

My guess is actually that the static engine (i.e. all plugins/dsp active all
the time) has built a basis that in order to implement PDC, Nuendo became
much more resource intensive than it otherwise needed to be. That's a guess
at best, but for sure since 3.0 it has become sluggish in areas I wouldn't
expect, with unpredictable high load behavior (which has actually been in
the audio engine since SX 1.0). Samplitude 8.11 demo has some serious bugs
(crashes if I record enable one midi track before the other has completely
disabled, for one), but is much snappier in response. Some workflow issues
still bother me, but others are nice. Actually I like the midi editor
slightly better than Nuendo's (other than missing a lot of features) - it's
a quick workflow with a few cool tool/modifiers Nuendo doesn't have, or at
least I haven't setup as a key command.

Do you have N3.2 on PC, and would you be interested in giving the test a
quick spin? If this bears out the way I think it might, I'll write a report
to send to Steinberg and RME and let them sort/fight it out, or more likely,
ignore it. ;-)

Regards,
Dedric

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:443679ab$1@linux...
>
> Hey Dedric,
>
> Well it seems that you've finally came to point where I've been stating
> for
> a while. I'm not as scientific as you are, I'm more of the "i don't why,
> but this is the way it it" :)
>
> I'll go further, being an early adopter to the Nuendo platform(version
> 1.1)I
> would say that Nuendo 1.5 (too me) was the sleekest, best sounding version
> to come along..
>
> My uneducated guess as to why Neundo 3.x is not as effiecient as
> Samplitude,
> is due to the following:
>
> -Summing mixer Algorithm(32 bit float)-after 40 tracks, with plugins
> things
> starts getting weird soundwise.
>
> -Warp engine..It has always hindered Acid's sound quality, why not
> Neundo's?
>
> -Vst performance: right now with the way that Pace is integrated in the
> application,
> I must say that running the "crack yields way better results in work
> flow..
> LaMont
>
> -
>
> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>>experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum
>>that
>>is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>>worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but
>>that

>>part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>>there.
>>
>>So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>>3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>>full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks,
> just
>>to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
>>Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
>>and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>>
>>At 64 sample latency:
>>DAW   # JCM900s
>>Nuendo   15
>>Samplitude 38
>>
>>(X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>>
>>Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
>>at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>>warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features,
>>etc,
>>etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles
>>it's
>>own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent
> of
>>ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At
>>128,
>>Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
>>for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in
>>what
>>sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be
>>consistent
>>on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to
> be
>>an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't
>>missing
>>something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was
> at
>>2048).
>>
>>Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all
> I
>>could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding
> more
>>- over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>>higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>>in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers

>>to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose
> a
>>little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>>
>>The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run
>>with
>>"Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>>run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking
> up
>>- given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but
>>something
>>about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add
> a
>>single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
>>lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
>>slow to reset the audio engine.
>>
>>I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
>>about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>>right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>>
>>The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause
> a
>>flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>>manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>>
>>Thanks!
>>Dedric
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by LaMont on Fri, 07 Apr 2006 18:17:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree with you..it's not RME and it's drivers. I have an Digi 96 PST card
and it's very fast on Samplitude,Gigastudio, and others..

To me and other SX users, things got slow and the sound changed when we update
to 3.x

Let's face it, SX/Nuendo has a lot of over-head in the app..You can almost
feel it. it's avery powerful app. Samplitude on the other hand is a hybrid
vst app. it's always been sleek and fast. When customers demanded vst integration,
vst was an addon, not a total "infusion" that samplitude fully depends on.

Anyway, to my ears Samplitude is thee best sounding DAW/editor on the market.
I master with it exclusivley. That's not saying anything bad about SX/Nuendo..

"Dedric Terry" <dedric@echomg.com> wrote:
>Hey Lamont,
>
>My investigation isn't really about sound quality as much as performance,

>but if I can get midi/VSTi and score to picture capabilities in Samplitude

>*and* it sounds better, I wouldn't mind switching.
>
>The point really is that Nuendo isn't performing as I would expect, esp.
at
>low latency. Some Nuendo users think RME drivers are to blame, but my
>Samplitude tests tell me otherwise.
>
>As far as the summing engine - both are 32-bit float all the way through,

>and that shouldn't have any affect on performance. I'll reserve judgement

>on the differences and whether that affects sound until I can test it out.

>Believe me, I'm not opposed to getting a better sounding app, but there
is a
>lot to give up compared to Nuendo for scoring and composing - a lot (tempo

>map/warp - Samplitude isn't even in the ballpark here; only one controller

>draw tool in Sam - freehand; etc).
>
>My guess is actually that the static engine (i.e. all plugins/dsp active
all
>the time) has built a basis that in order to implement PDC, Nuendo became

>much more resource intensive than it otherwise needed to be. That's a guess

>at best, but for sure since 3.0 it has become sluggish in areas I wouldn't

>expect, with unpredictable high load behavior (which has actually been in

>the audio engine since SX 1.0). Samplitude 8.11 demo has some serious bugs

>(crashes if I record enable one midi track before the other has completely

>disabled, for one), but is much snappier in response. Some workflow issues

>still bother me, but others are nice. Actually I like the midi editor

>slightly better than Nuendo's (other than missing a lot of features) - it's

>a quick workflow with a few cool tool/modifiers Nuendo doesn't have, or
at
>least I haven't setup as a key command.
>
>Do you have N3.2 on PC, and would you be interested in giving the test a

>quick spin? If this bears out the way I think it might, I'll write a report

>to send to Steinberg and RME and let them sort/fight it out, or more likely,

>ignore it. ;-)
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote in message news:443679ab$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey Dedric,
>>
>> Well it seems that you've finally came to point where I've been stating

>> for
>> a while. I'm not as scientific as you are, I'm more of the "i don't why,
>> but this is the way it it" :)
>>
>> I'll go further, being an early adopter to the Nuendo platform(version

>> 1.1)I
>> would say that Nuendo 1.5 (too me) was the sleekest, best sounding version
>> to come along..
>>
>> My uneducated guess as to why Neundo 3.x is not as effiecient as
>> Samplitude,
>> is due to the following:
>>
>> -Summing mixer Algorithm(32 bit float)-after 40 tracks, with plugins
>> things
>> starts getting weird soundwise.
>>
>> -Warp engine..It has always hindered Acid's sound quality, why not
>> Neundo's?
>>
>> -Vst performance: right now with the way that Pace is integrated in the

>> application,
>> I must say that running the "crack yields way better results in work

>> flow..
>> LaMont
>>
>> -
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>>>experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum

>>>that
>>>is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>>>worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but

>>>that
>>>part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>>>there.
>>>
>>>So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>>>3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>>>full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks,
>> just
>>>to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded
8
>>>Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
>>>and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>>>
>>>At 64 sample latency:
>>>DAW   # JCM900s
>>>Nuendo   15
>>>Samplitude 38
>>>
>>>(X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>>>
>>>Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have
PDC
>>>at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>>>warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features,

>>>etc,
>>>etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles

>>>it's
>>>own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent
>> of
>>>ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At

>>>128,
>>>Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"

>>>for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in

>>>what
>>>sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be
>>>consistent
>>>on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to
>> be
>>>an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't
>>>missing
>>>something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was
>> at
>>>2048).
>>>
>>>Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's
all
>> I
>>>could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding
>> more
>>>- over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>>>higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>>>in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
>>>to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to
lose
>> a
>>>little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>>>
>>>The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run

>>>with
>>>"Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>>>run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking
>> up
>>>- given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but
>>>something
>>>about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add
>> a
>>>single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted
when
>>>lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it
is
>>>slow to reset the audio engine.
>>>
>>>I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
>>>about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>>>right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>>>
>>>The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause
>> a

>>>flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>>>manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>>>
>>>Thanks!
>>>Dedric
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by Bill Lorentzen on Sun, 09 Apr 2006 01:49:11 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You might want to compare features in Seqoia with Nuendo. Sam and Seqoia are the same sort of relationship as Cubase and Nuendo. Seqoia has more post production features as I understand it. I use Sam.

Sorry I don't have time to try any testing.

Bill

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
news:C05B2D13.2671%dterry@keyofd.net...
> Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
> experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum
> that
> is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
> worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but
> that
> part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
> there.
>
> So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
> 3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
> full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks,
> just
> to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
> Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
> and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>
> At 64 sample latency:
> DAW   # JCM900s
> Nuendo   15
> Samplitude 38
>
> (X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)

>
> Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
> at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
> warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features,
> etc,
> etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles
> it's
> own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent
> of
> ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At
> 128,
> Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
> for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in
> what
> sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be
> consistent
> on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be
> an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't
> missing
> something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was
> at
> 2048).
>
> Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all
> I
> could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding
> more
> - over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
> higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
> in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
> to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose
> a
> little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>
> The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run
> with
> "Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
> run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking
> up
> - given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but
> something
> about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a
> single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
> lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
> slow to reset the audio engine.
>
> I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
> about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't

> right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>
> The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause
> a
> flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
> manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>
> Thanks!
> Dedric
>

Subject: Re: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by Dedric Terry on Sun, 09 Apr 2006 02:50:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks Bill. I was thinking the same as far as features, but no demo for Sequoia (not surprisingly). I may have another option to evaluate it anyway.

For audio engine/driver performance though, there shouldn't be any difference, but I'll have to get Sam7/8 to get on the forum to actually find out from the developers.

No problem on testing - I know everyone here is busy.

Regards,
Dedric

On 4/8/06 7:49 PM, in article 443869de@linux, "Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:

> You might want to compare features in Seqoia with Nuendo. Sam and Seqoia are
> the same sort of relationship as Cubase and Nuendo. Seqoia has more post
> production features as I understand it. I use Sam.
>
> Sorry I don't have time to try any testing.
>
> Bill
>
> "Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
> news:C05B2D13.2671%dterry@keyofd.net...
>> Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>> experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum
>> that
>> is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>> worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but
>> that

>> part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>> there.
>>
>> So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>> 3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>> full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks,
>> just
>> to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
>> Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
>> and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>>
>> At 64 sample latency:
>> DAW # JCM900s
>> Nuendo 15
>> Samplitude 38
>>
>> (X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>>
>> Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
>> at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>> warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features,
>> etc,
>> etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles
>> it's
>> own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent
>> of
>> ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At
>> 128,
>> Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
>> for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in
>> what
>> sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be
>> consistent
>> on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be
>> an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't
>> missing
>> something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was
>> at
>> 2048).
>>
>> Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all
>> I
>> could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding
>> more
>> - over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>> higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>> in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
>> to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose

>> a
>> little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>>
>> The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run
>> with
>> "Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>> run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking
>> up
>> - given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but
>> something
>> about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a
>> single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
>> lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
>> slow to reset the audio engine.
>>
>> I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
>> about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>> right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>>
>> The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause
>> a
>> flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>> manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>>
>> Thanks!
>> Dedric
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by audioguy_editout_ on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 05:25:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Dedric,

Sorry, I haven't had time to run these tests... I haven't
forgotten about you! It is a zoo at the office right now...
as soon as time permits, I will do the tests and forward the
results.

Regards,

David.

Dedric Terry wrote:

> Thanks David! What audio card(s) do you have? What are your system specs?
>
> The test is pretty basic, but will give me an idea of comparative driver
> performance - just an sine wave (100Hz will do) stereo audio track; copied
> to 96 tracks; loop about 10 seconds or so of it at zero crossings.
>
> Put JMC900 in all 8 inserts of a track and copy that to another 2 tracks,
> with all plugins disabled. Run at 64 samples with "Low Latency" off in
> expert audio settings and enable plugins until Nuendo starts sputtering or
> crackling. Record the count when it can loop over a 10 second or so segment
> 4-5 times without sputtering. Repeat at 128, 256 and 512 sample latency.
> Also try a run at 64 with "Adjust for Record Latency" off, and the Constrain
> PDC button on, just for curiosity - probably won't make any difference (the
> first setting shouldn't at least).
>
> The ideal scenario is to compare Nuendo to Samplitude on each system, but if
> you don't have time to load the Sam8.11 demo, or if you don't have it, no
> problem. Different systems will perform differently, so comparing systems
> isn't of as much value as comparing an audio driver on a single system
> between N3.2 and Samplitude 8 using the same plugins, audio files, and ASIO
> driver latency. I'm going to load the Sonar 5 demo tomorrow and give it a
> try too.
>
> Thanks!
> Dedric
>
> On 4/6/06 11:57 PM, in article 44360119@linux, "Dave(EK Sound)"
> <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:
>
>
>>I can do some NU3 tests for you tomorrow if you like.
>>
>>David.
>>
>>Dedric Terry wrote:
>>
>>>Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>>>experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum that
>>>is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>>>worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but that
>>>part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>>>there.
>>>
>>>So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>>>3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>>>full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks, just
>>>to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
>>>Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,

>>>and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>>>
>>>At 64 sample latency:
>>>DAW # JCM900s
>>>Nuendo 15
>>>Samplitude 38
>>>
>>>(X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>>>
>>>Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
>>>at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>>>warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features, etc,
>>>etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles it's
>>>own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent of
>>>ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At 128,
>>>Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
>>>for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in what
>>>sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be consistent
>>>on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be
>>>an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't missing
>>>something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was at
>>>2048).
>>>
>>>Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all I
>>>could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding more
>>>- over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>>>higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>>>in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
>>>to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose a
>>>little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>>>
>>>The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run with
>>>"Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>>>run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking up
>>>- given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but something
>>>about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a
>>>single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
>>>lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
>>>slow to reset the audio engine.
>>>
>>>I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
>>>about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>>>right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>>>
>>>The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause a
>>>flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>>>manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>>>

>>>Thanks!
>>>Dedric
>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Request for Nuendo and/or Samplitude users
Posted by Dedric Terry on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 05:41:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hey David - no problem. Real work comes first.

Thanks!
Dedric

On 4/11/06 11:25 PM, in article 443c9109$1@linux, "Dave(EK Sound)"
<audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:

> Hi Dedric,
>
> Sorry, I haven't had time to run these tests... I haven't
> forgotten about you! It is a zoo at the office right now...
> as soon as time permits, I will do the tests and forward the
> results.
>
> Regards,
>
> David.
>
> Dedric Terry wrote:
>
>> Thanks David! What audio card(s) do you have? What are your system specs?
>>
>> The test is pretty basic, but will give me an idea of comparative driver
>> performance - just an sine wave (100Hz will do) stereo audio track; copied
>> to 96 tracks; loop about 10 seconds or so of it at zero crossings.
>>
>> Put JMC900 in all 8 inserts of a track and copy that to another 2 tracks,
>> with all plugins disabled. Run at 64 samples with "Low Latency" off in
>> expert audio settings and enable plugins until Nuendo starts sputtering or
>> crackling. Record the count when it can loop over a 10 second or so segment
>> 4-5 times without sputtering. Repeat at 128, 256 and 512 sample latency.
>> Also try a run at 64 with "Adjust for Record Latency" off, and the Constrain
>> PDC button on, just for curiosity - probably won't make any difference (the
>> first setting shouldn't at least).
>>
>> The ideal scenario is to compare Nuendo to Samplitude on each system, but if

>> you don't have time to load the Sam8.11 demo, or if you don't have it, no
>> problem. Different systems will perform differently, so comparing systems
>> isn't of as much value as comparing an audio driver on a single system
>> between N3.2 and Samplitude 8 using the same plugins, audio files, and ASIO
>> driver latency. I'm going to load the Sonar 5 demo tomorrow and give it a
>> try too.
>>
>> Thanks!
>> Dedric
>>
>> On 4/6/06 11:57 PM, in article 44360119@linux, "Dave(EK Sound)"
>> <audioguy_editout_@shaw.ca> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> I can do some NU3 tests for you tomorrow if you like.
>>>
>>> David.
>>>
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>
>>>> Anyone with Nuendo and/or Samplitude (or the demo) interested in a little
>>>> experiment? There has been a hardware test thread on the Nuendo forum that
>>>> is claiming RME drivers are way less efficient than Lynx and MOTU - okay,
>>>> worth reporting to RME, as long as it's really RME and not Nuendo, but that
>>>> part seems to be taboo on the Nuendo forum, so I bailed on posting this
>>>> there.
>>>>
>>>> So, for fun, or out of frustration more likely I decided to compare Nuendo
>>>> 3.2 to Samplitude 8.11 (demo) using my RME Digiface (2.94 drivers, latest
>>>> full release). I loaded up a single sine wave, copied it to 96 tracks,
>>>> just
>>>> to load the audio engine (don't care about disc streaming). I loaded 8
>>>> Gsuite JCM900s (freeware) on the first few tracks and here's what I found,
>>>> and what I would like to confirm with other users:
>>>>
>>>> At 64 sample latency:
>>>> DAW   # JCM900s
>>>> Nuendo   15
>>>> Samplitude 38
>>>>
>>>> (X2 4400 dual core; A8V Deluxe; 2G Ram; RME Digiface 2.94; etc)
>>>>
>>>> Holy crap - that's over twice the performance. So, does Sam8 not have PDC
>>>> at all? I know Nuendo has a long list of other features, such as audio
>>>> warp, scoring, midi and VSTi capabilities beyond Sam's, post features, etc,
>>>> etc, but that's over twice the performance. I know Samplitude handles it's
>>>> own audio buffering internally, which seems to be completely independent of
>>>> ASIO buffers, and to some degree seems to ignore ASIO buffers too. At 128,

>>>> Nuendo caught up - 39 JCMs. I have no doubt that there is a "sweet spot"
>>>> for DAWs, simply based on how they buffer, process and stream data, in what
>>>> sizes, etc, so optimal ASIO or internal buffer settings won't be consistent
>>>> on different systems, and certainly not between apps, but this seems to be
>>>> an extreme difference (I triple checked the test to be sure I wasn't
>>>> missing
>>>> something basic, but couldn't find anythig. Samplitude's VIP buffer was at
>>>> 2048).
>>>>
>>>> Now, not being a Samplitude user, here's my lack of knowledge - that's all
>>>> I
>>>> could get out of it at any latency in the RME card. Nuendo kept adding
>>>> more
>>>> - over 64 at 512 samples. Why does Samplitude seem to gain nothing from
>>>> higher latency at the audio card? I'm sure I'm probably missing something
>>>> in understanding Samplitude's buffer approach (I did tweak the VIP buffers
>>>> to 8192 to get 38 plugins at 512 samples on the RME, but it seemed to lose
>>>> a
>>>> little performance at higher RME latency - not what I would expect).
>>>>
>>>> The other side of this is Nuendo has low latency issues. This was run with
>>>> "Low Latency" off in expert audio settings. With it on, it wouldn't even
>>>> run the 96 instances of a single audio file, no plugins, without breaking
>>>> up
>>>> - given what it is supposedly for, that can be reasoned away, but something
>>>> about Nuendo's PDC doesn't seem right to me - "disabling" it didn't add a
>>>> single plugin to the test results. Nuendo also needs to be restarted when
>>>> lowering latency settings or runs much worse than if restarted, and it is
>>>> slow to reset the audio engine.
>>>>
>>>> I'm trying to get to the bottom of some longstanding questions I've had
>>>> about Nuendo's performance since 3.0, and also since 3.2. Something isn't
>>>> right. Any takers to dive into sorting this out?
>>>>
>>>> The Nuendo forum is too volatile right now. Posting this would just cause
>>>> a
>>>> flame war and I'm in no mood to get burned. I'm not partial to any
>>>> manufacturer - just figuring out where the weak spots are.
>>>>
>>>> Thanks!
>>>> Dedric
>>>>
>>
>>