Subject: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP
Posted by Dedric Terry on Wed, 28 Nov 2007 23:10:07 GMT

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_00B0_01C831D9.2514E610
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,
Dedric

------=_NextPart_000_00B0_01C831D9.2514E610
Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

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

------=_NextPart_000_00B0_01C831D9.2514E610--

Subject: Re: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP
Posted by TCB on Thu, 29 Nov 2007 00:42:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It's a micro/mach kernel vs. monolithic kernel issue. It's never going to
change. In theory you get a stability bump, and there are some systems with
staggering stability records. The effin FILE SYSTEM can be restarted without
a reboot with a true microkernel. But you pay a penalty with low latency
applications and some file system issues.

My guess is GNU/Linux could do a little better than XP if the software were
really done right. But probably less than the penalty paid with a microkernel.
A couple of percent, tops.

Vista is the worst of both worlds! Monolithic kernel panics with so much
DRM and poorly implemented security that you get the instability of a monolithic
kernel with the performance hit of micro/mach! Leave it to Redmond to manage
that.

It's XP for audio and Debian for everything else in my world.

TCB

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>
>
>A Nuendo 4 Mac user recently posted some test results on OSX vs. XP on =
>the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):
>
>On the Mac he put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage) and EQs on =
>all channels for up to 32 channels and
>the cpu was at 90% with stutters and slow GUI response at 1024 sample =
>buffers. (N4 is now 64-bit for OSX).
>
>On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no glitches =
>and smooth response. He dropped latency to
>512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and playback.
>
>Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing at all - purely a real world =

>technical comparison. I've always been interested in a head to head of
=
>operating systems. Also take it for what its' worth until more tests =
>come in.
>
>At the moment, from all of the tests I've seen, it looks like XP can =
>handle the highest load/cpu utilization of Vista, XP and OSX.
>No way of knowing where Linux would compare.
>
>Just an interesting fyi. It's not a huge difference, but even at 5-6% =
>increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista.
>For some users it may be worth noting - esp. GUI responsiveness - for =
>others, not a big deal.
>
>I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I figured OSX =
>and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra
>graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =20
>
>Regards,
>Dedric
>
>
><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
><HTML><HEAD>
><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
>charset=3Diso-8859-1">
><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16546" name=3DGENERATOR>
><STYLE></STYLE>
></HEAD>
><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>A Nuendo 4 Mac user recently =
>posted some test=20
>results on OSX vs. XP on the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):

On =
>the Mac he=20
>put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage) and EQs on all =
>channels for up=20
>to 32 channels and</FONT></DIV>
><DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>the cpu was at 90% with stutters and =
>slow GUI=20
>response at 1024 sample buffers. (N4 is now 64-bit for=20
>OSX).</FONT></DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>
><DIV>
On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no =
>glitches=20
>and smooth response. He dropped latency to</DIV>
><DIV>512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and=20
>playback.</DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><DIV>Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing at all - purely a =

>real=20
>world technical comparison. I've always been interested in a head =
>to head=20
>of operating systems. Also take it for what its' worth until more =
>tests=20
>come in.</DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><DIV>At the moment, from all of the tests I've seen, it looks like=20
>XP can handle the highest load/cpu utilization of Vista, XP =
>and=20
>OSX.</DIV>
><DIV>No way of knowing where Linux would compare.</DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><DIV>Just an interesting fyi. It's not a huge difference, but even =
>at 5-6%=20
>increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista.</DIV>
><DIV>For some users it may be worth noting - esp. GUI=20
>responsiveness - for others, not a big deal.</DIV>
><DIV>
I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I =
>figured OSX=20
>and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra</DIV>
><DIV>graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =
></FONT></DIV><FONT=20
>face=3DArial size=3D2>
><DIV>
Regards,</DIV>
><DIV>Dedric
</DIV></FONT></BODY></HTML>
>
>