Subject: Some test results on JJ 5751

Posted by Aki on Tue, 05 Jun 2012 13:56:26 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Have been testing a batch of newly released JJ 5751, and came up with some test results that I thought I might share with folks here.

Visually, JJ 5751 is identical to JJ ECC83S. Same glass, same plate structure. Electrically, they are definitely different creatures.

The numbers below were from a batch of 20 JJ 5751, tested at Ip=1mA, Ep=200V. Average numbers from JAN GE 5751 and JJ ECC83S on the same tester are listed for comparison.

JJ 5751 JAN GE 5751 JJ ECC83S

Conductance: 2000 1650 1800

Mu: 82 75 95

From the numbers above, calculated plate resistance are similar between JJ 5751 and JAN 5751.

Of course, this is only a test at a particular operating point and not a full curve trace by any means. But you get a general idea as to how JJ 5751 would behave.

Subject: Re: Some test results on JJ 5751

Posted by Wayne Parham on Tue, 05 Jun 2012 14:23:41 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That's good information, thanks!

Subject: Re: Some test results on JJ 5751

Posted by gofar99 on Fri, 15 Mar 2013 22:35:10 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi, I just saw this thread and wanted to add a bit of information to it. I use 5751s in several designs. Mostly Jan Phillips and Sovtek ones as they cover the warmer and hotter ends of the range. I find both to be great in Oddwatt amps. I tried a batch of JJ ones in the same amps and they do not work well. The sound was quite inferior to either of the other two types. The ones I got were constructed differently as well. The internal structure looked more like a 6J6 RF tube than any of the 12A_7 or variants. Certainly not like the 5751s I was using. They have small square anodes set low in the bottles. I made the recommendation (as much as I really like JJ

tubes) to not use them in any of the Oddwatt designs.

Subject: Re: Some test results on JJ 5751 Posted by bestfriend on Thu, 28 Nov 2013 12:11:05 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The title says it all. Why? Why do so few manufacturers use them?