

---

Subject: Author of Vertex needs some input from us to improve !!

Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 08:37:44 GMT

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

---

Hi,

Well this guy is willing to help us out with whatever benefits will arise for him by buying his plugin...

Note that his plugin has a discount until 31 of January , around 46-47 \$ final price.

WE HAVE TO SHOW our appreciation on developers like him as we can ask for further Paris support, like maybe wdm drivers ???

NOW he asks for some input from us.

Here is what he wrote on his last email...

To be flexible enough it is certainly possible to choose a much larger latency buffer, but consider this: A buffer consumes memory, e.g. 65536 samples need 262144 bytes per channel (each sample is 32 bit floating point for VST).

If you run e.g. 48 (stereo?)-tracks with 48 instances of FaderWorks you need  $48 * 2 * 262144$  bytes = 25 MB of memory. Should be no problem for today's computers, but some users have Win98, so I'm not sure if RAM memory could be an issue. If not, I would suggest about 132000 samples as upper limit (needs about 1 MB per FaderWorks instance). What do you (or others) think about it?

---

---

Subject: Re: Author of Vertex needs some input from us to improve !!

Posted by [duncan](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 16:42:13 GMT

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

---

The Vertex site lists "Win 2000 or XP" as minimum requirements -- do we know whether or not it runs on 98?

-- I guess maybe I'll email him myself. Just thought I'd mention this in case others are considering.

thanks -- chas.

On 22 Jan 2007 18:37:44 +1000, "Dimitrios" <[musurgio@otenet.gr](mailto:musurgio@otenet.gr)> wrote:

>

>Hi,

>Well this guy is willing to help us out with whatever benefits will arise

>for him by buying his plugin...

>Note that his plugin has a discount until 31 of January , around 46-47 \$

>final price.

>WE HAVE TO SHOW our appreciation on developers like him as we can ask for

>further Paris support, like maybe wdm drivers ???

>NOW he asks for some input from us.

>Here is what he wrote on his last email...

>To be flexible enough it is certainly possible to choose a much larger latency  
>buffer, but consider this: A buffer consumes memory, e.g. 65536 samples need  
>262144 bytes per channel (each sample is 32 bit floating point for VST).  
>If you run e.g. 48 (stereo?)-tracks with 48 instances of FaderWorks you need  
>48 \* 2 \* 262144 bytes = 25 MB of memory. Should be no problem for today's  
>computers, but some users have Win98, so I'm not sure if RAM memory could  
>be an issue. If not, I would suggest about 132000 samples as upper limit  
>(needs about 1 MB per FaderWorks instance). What do you (or others) think  
>about it?  
>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: Author of Vertex needs some input from us to improve !!  
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Mon, 22 Jan 2007 18:27:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Glad you mention it.  
YES it will work under win98 and Me but "officially" there is no support  
for these platforms.  
Don't worry though because he is helpful all the way.  
hats why he suuggest maximum 132000 samples latency for win98 users who dopn't  
have large amount of ram.  
Regards,  
Dimitrios

Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:  
>  
>The Vertex site lists "Win 2000 or XP" as minimum requirements -- do  
>we know whether or not it runs on 98?  
>  
>-- I guess maybe I'll email him myself. Just thought I'd mention this  
>in case others are considering.  
>  
>thanks -- chas.  
>  
>On 22 Jan 2007 18:37:44 +1000, "Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:  
>  
>>  
>>Hi,  
>>Well this guy is willing to help us out with whatever benefits will arrise  
>>for him by buying his plugin...  
>>Note that his plugin has a discount until 31 of January , around 46-47  
>>\$  
>>final price.  
>>WE HAVE TO SHOW our appreciation on developers like him as we can ask for  
>>further Paris support, like maybe wdm drivers ???

>>NOW he asks for some input from us.  
>>Here is what he wrote on his last email...  
>>To be flexible enough it is certainly possible to choose a much larger latency  
>>buffer, but consider this: A buffer consumes memory, e.g. 65536 samples need  
>>262144 bytes per channel (each sample is 32 bit floating point for VST).  
>>If you run e.g. 48 (stereo?)-tracks with 48 instances of FaderWorks you need  
>>48 \* 2 \* 262144 bytes = 25 MB of memory. Should be no problem for today's  
>>computers, but some users have Win98, so I'm not sure if RAM memory could  
>>be an issue. If not, I would suggest about 132000 samples as upper limit  
>>(needs about 1 MB per FaderWorks instance). What do you (or others) think  
>>about it?  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>

---