
Subject: DEQX

Posted by [jphaggar](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2009 00:56:12 GMT

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

I know Jim Griffin and Rick Craig are using DEQX processor/active crossover , I am actually using DCX 2496 from behringer that already outperformed the passive crossover by a good margin , there is no doubt the difference is huge in price and quality , but some specialist can upgrade the DCX to very refined levels according to them like :ASi Technologies that is said to take the unit to an unbelievable level of transparency but at a price as high as 2000\$ to 3000 \$.I'm willing to invest that amount in a high end processor for my line array for triamping .Need advise please .Thanks

Subject: Re: DEQX

Posted by [lcholke](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2009 03:46:05 GMT

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

Hi, The unit will have a big improvement with better output opamps. I changed mine and it was very transparent. The main problem is the volume obtaining a 4-channel control. If you do the work yourself there are low cost kits and instructions on the web. Another way to solve the biamp challenge, that is lower cost without some of the DCX pain, is by using 2 DEQs and sending the outputs to 2 DACs. I would use a quality DAC for the highs and a mid-fi dac for the lows (or the one in the DEQ?). The DEQ has a fair amount of attenuation to solve the volume ctrl problem, though a small pain, and I did not hear any sound deterioration through the Krell and Maggies that were playing. I plan to go this way as soon as I get the need to upgrade. Linc

Subject: Re: DEQX

Posted by [jphaggar](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2009 09:20:02 GMT

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

speaking of DEQ I don't understand how they would replace the crossover ? unless I didn't get the idea !DEQX has a lot of processing power and room correction in one unit;in one word it would replace using DCX plus DEQ together , but the question is : which will outperform in transparency ? unless I use a modified DCX I won't get the smoothness and transparency of DEQX , in this case we are talking about the same price .the question is : where should I spend my \$\$\$'s.Thanks JP

Subject: Re: DEQX

Posted by [Jim Griffin](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2009 01:16:24 GMT

JP, To me this is a no brainer. I can not imagine why anyone would pay \$2000-3000 for mods to a product (the DCX) that retails for about \$300. Unless you have the ability to make the mods yourself and save a bunch of money, you are so much the better to purchase the DEQX. Among the DEQX capabilities/features (see www.deqx.com) are: Linear phase 3-way digital crossovers with the ability to achieve perfect phase, amplitude, and time matching; Inherent EQ and external tweakable EQ; Room EQ capability to address room integration issues; An easy to use computer interface with supported user group software; A built-in measurement and calibration system so you can see and solve issues that arise; Two digital and two analog inputs with full six channel remote for source selection, digital volume control, and adhoc EQ (DEQX preamp option model). You will be so much better off with fewer hardware and software issues with the DEQX compared to the modified DCX. I highly recommend the DEQX. I've had mine for nearly five years and with the latest DEQX upgrades (which I think are included in the current production units) it continues to be exceptional. All that for a current price of just over \$3000 US. Jim

Subject: Re: DEQX

Posted by [lcholke](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2009 15:27:45 GMT

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

The clarity is mostly maintained when processing the digital signal and lost in the analog conversion. The DCX does not have a digital out, so the distortion comes mainly from their internal DAC. The DEQ has the digital out so you can use the dac of your choice and keep all the clarity. Signal > DEQ Left > Dac left > Amp..... > DEQ Right > Dac Right > Amp Not as simple as the DEQX, but the cost is lower and you are not tied into the DEQX dac. -Linc

Subject: Re: DEQX

Posted by [jp](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 11:15:27 GMT

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

Jim Your arguments are 100% convincing. I actually use a Copland CTA 301 MK II preamp would the DEQX preamp be better ? or is it in any case better to go for the preamp version ? Thanks JP

Subject: Re: DEQX

Posted by [Jim Griffin](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2009 01:22:07 GMT

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

JP,I have never heard the Copland unit so for me it is difficult to compare to the DEQX preamp unit. Remember I'm an engineer so I do not have subjective feelings for tube gear such as the Copland. My digital sources are a Denon DVD/CD player, Directv receiver, or an Integra CD player so digital signals go directly into the DEQX without extra conversion to analog and then back to digital. I can route analog sources--FM tuner or Nakamichi cassette deck in my case into the DEQX and then have its ADC to do its thing. But my goal is to minimize the analog paths and do as much processing in the digital world as possible. The DEQX then uses its DAC to provide output analog signals to my multichannel power amp. Bottom line is fewer interconnects and minimal signal conversions along the way. The DEQX preamp version does the 6 channel digital world volume control, input selection between two digital sources or two analog sources, and EQ with remote control which to me is worth the difference vs. their standard unit. You can also easily select between various calibration profiles with the remote. Take a look at the features and such on the DEQX site and decide which unit would work best for your situation. Jim
