

---

Subject: Another idea :-)

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2004 20:54:06 GMT

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

---

Well, how about "enhanced" SRPP, with anode choke in the "upper"  $R_k$  position? "Ordinary" SRPP has good features (simple, direct coupling between triodes, every tube has  $B+ / 2$  and the same  $I_a$ , "upper" tube is load for the lower tube and cathode follower at the same time, etc.), but  $R_i$  for the lower tube is not CCS, actually pretty low with lower  $\mu$  tubes:  $R_i = r_p + (\mu + 1)R_k$ . If we use CCS or anode choke (choke impedance  $Z = 2\pi f L$ ) for "upper"  $R_k$ , then this high  $R_k$  is further "multiplied" with upper tube  $\mu$ , and we have very large  $R_i$  ( $A \sim \mu$ , low distortion) and very low output resistance. We can use anode output on the lower tube, too. Schematic shows values for the "Lundahl" LL1668 choke (100H, 25mA and 680 Ohms DC resistance,  $R_w$ ). We don't have to use the same  $R_k$  like  $R_w$ , or the same  $U_{ak}$ , or even the same tubes. It's desirable that  $R_w$  is low, with values on the schematics we'd get about 11mA through SRPP. Nice thing is that choke parameters ( $L, C_w \dots$ ) are not that critical in this (SRPP) position like in the anode load use. But, I don't have any plate choke to try it in the real world. We need a volunteer to actually try it. (If we use the same double triode for lower and upper tube, then our heater supply must be "referenced" to about 90V - better use one 5687 for both lower triodes and another for upper, the upper  $U_h$  referenced to about 200V.).

---

---

Subject: Re: Another idea :-)

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sun, 26 Dec 2004 19:27:24 GMT

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

---

Found this link regarding SRPPs. Thought it might be of interest.....Colin  
[http://www.tubecad.com/articles\\_2002/SRPP\\_Deconstructed/index.html](http://www.tubecad.com/articles_2002/SRPP_Deconstructed/index.html)

---

---

Subject: Re: Another idea :-)

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 26 Dec 2004 22:33:45 GMT

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

---

Huh, I lost my concentration a few times, but I read it (+ another SRPP article from 2000.). Hm, the author analysis shows more or less negative results...I can't say that choke version works good or not, as I said - I didn't try it. If it means anything, some people (who built this circuit) claim good results, especially with anode output...

---

---

Subject: Re: Another idea :-(  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Mon, 27 Dec 2004 16:30:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You made it further into the article than I did. I wouldn't be too bumbed about the author not liking the topology. It's just one person's opinion, and like you said, other have had good results. I just posted it as a technical reference.....Colin

---