

---

Subject: Neil.....are you crowding the Pulsar?  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Tue, 26 Dec 2006 18:00:07 GMT

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

---

IOW, are you able to slam the stems out of Cubase into the CW DSP and "mix hot" as we can do with Paris?

I'm going to be moving my mom to some new digs this week so I'm at least 10 days away from getting back to the lab. Once the lab is open again, barring unforeseen delays, another DAW with a Gigabyte GA-K8NS Ultra 939 mobo, 2 G RAM and an AMD 64 4800 x 2 CPU with 2 x HDSP 9652's and an HDSP Multiface PCI shall spew forth. I'm gonna be able to do some direct summing comparisons of Paris vs Creamware at that point.

---

---

Subject: Re: Neil.....are you crowding the Pulsar?  
Posted by [neil\[1\]](#) on Tue, 26 Dec 2006 20:33:41 GMT

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

---

"DJ" <[nowayjose@dude.net](mailto:nowayjose@dude.net)> wrote:

>IOW, are you able to slam the stems out of Cubase into the CW DSP and "mix

>hot" as we can do with Paris?

Not even trying to - since I'm going out via digilight, I'm peakstop limiting each submix at -0.03 db before it hits the Pulsar inputs. Then I'm keeping all submixes/sums at zero in the Pulsar Mixer, and varying the Master level a bit, since I've been playing with that Optimaster plugin - the limiter therein isn't exactly brickwall, I'm finding.

Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: Neil.....are you crowding the Pulsar?  
Posted by [Bill Lorentzen](#) on Thu, 28 Dec 2006 11:38:38 GMT

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

---

Neil, when you made the clip below was there any other processing in the signal flow? Was that a straight up comparison? Don't mean to imply you don't know what you are doing, but I was pretty amazed at the difference. If the summing in Pulsar is that much better, then I gotta have one!

I can always use more synths too. You have yours in a separate machine? Is it possible to route the stems straight from Cubase into the Pulsar all in one box?

If you are recording at 88.2 then are you sending 8 x SMUX chans or do you have 16 chans?

Bill

"Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:45917915\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <nowayjose@dude.net> wrote:

>>IOW, are you able to slam the stems out of Cubase into the CW DSP and "mix

>

>>hot" as we can do with Paris?

>

> Not even trying to - since I'm going out via digilight, I'm

> peakstop limiting each submix at -0.03 db before it hits the

> Pulsar inputs. Then I'm keeping all submixes/sums at zero in the

> Pulsar Mixer, and varying the Master level a bit, since I've

> been playing with that Optimaster plugin - the limiter therein

> isn't exactly brickwall, I'm finding.

>

> Neil

---

Subject: Re: Neil.....are you crowding the Pulsar?

Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Thu, 28 Dec 2006 15:21:12 GMT

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

---

"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:

>Neil, when you made the clip below was there any other

>processing in the signal flow?

Yes, a little bit: as I had mentioned before, in order to not send out a digital signal with any overs, I inserted a peakstop limiter across each submix in Cubase... this didn't have too much of an effect, though, because I set the threshold to zero & the limiting to only -0.03. Two of the busses didn't have any overs registering to begin with, but just to be safe I left the limiters in; the drum submix had perhaps a half-dozen overs throughout the entire song & the remaining submix had I think just 2 or 3, so these limiters certainly weren't hammering the signals very much at all... if you've seen any of my posts back when we were discussing how Native mixing differs from Paris, you'll recall one of the big things I mentioned was that you have to mind your gain structure - so if I practice what I preach, then it should be clear that these limiters were not impacting the sound in anything more than an extremely miniscule fashion.

Also, in this comparison there was a limiter across the 2-buss in Pulsar - this was to emulate the 2-buss limiter that I had used on the Cubase-only mix (remember, I had said this was the BEST mix I could get in Cubase, so to make it comparable, I had to try & emulate the same processing in Pulsar). The limiter I used in the Cubase mix was the one in Izotope's Ozone, the one I used in Pulsar was the one in their mastering plugin, Optimaster. Both were set to the same threshold (which was, IIRC, -2 or -3db), and for essentially a smooth, transparent limiting character.

>Was that a straight up comparison?

As straight-up as I could get it, while still replicating the same - albiet minor - processing that I had going in Cubase.

>Don't mean to imply you don't know what you are doing,

Never fear, there are plenty who've beaten you to that. I've done enough straight a/b comparisons with no back-end processing to be convinced that there WAS something different going on when you stemmed-out a Native mix or summed it differently, so I needed to do a "best mix" comparison.... this was the first one. I've done a couple more since I posted that & once I get a chance to re-listen to them with fresh ears, I'll post clips of those, if I'm satisfied with the difference, so you guys can hear 'em.

>but I was pretty amazed at the difference. If the summing in >Pulsar is that much better, then I gotta have one!

Very slight differences in processing aside, I'm pretty impressed with the sonic improvement, too. Since the Submix limiters were barely touching a half-dozen overs across an entire song on I don't think that we can attribute ANY audible difference to those, and the only other difference was the 2-buss limiters... since the one in Ozone doesn't exactly suck (if you've used it you'll know what I'm talking about) I don't think we can attribute the openness & clarity of the Pulsar-summed version to the difference in 2-buss limiters... you COULD say that the difference in punchiness might be due to this - if so, then fine; again, if I had intended this clip to be an objective listening test, I wouldn't have prejudiced everyone's opinion upfront by saying "here's what I'm hearing the differences as..." right when I posted the link.

>I can always use more synths too. You have yours in a separate >machine? Is it possible to route the stems straight from

>Cubase into the Pulsar all in one box?

I do have the Pulsar card on a separate machine from my Cubase rig. Also, I don't even know if I have ANY synths on this version of the Creamware software - I don't think that I do - Thad apparently got the Pro Card package (it's about \$1,250) that has both the Mix & Master pack AND the Synths & Samplers pack of software... with the other cards you have to pick which one you want (or pay extra if you want both). As far as if you can route stems or individual channels through the Pulsar card internally if you have them on one box, then the answer is: "Yes, if you're using any of the following sample rates... 32k, 44.1k, 48k, 96k" if you're using 88.2k, you can't do it - the card will clock to it, but it doesn't report it back to your Native software app properly, so it plays back at the wrong speed & the files are all out of time, on top of that. I wish I could, because then I could just sum all my individual channels through the Pulsar mixer like DeeJ is apparently doing, and not have to even do submixes.

>If you are recording at 88.2 then are you sending 8 x SMUX  
>chans or do you have 16 chans?

Eight S/Mux channels (equaling four stereo submixes); which is the most I can send out of my Multifaces, anyway (one lightpipe out per Multiface) or receive in the one Pulsar card (two lightpipe in's) at that samplerate.

Neil

---