

START NEW THREAD	REPLY	Top of Thread	LIST
----------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	----------------------

Read 95 times

From:	PeteR (valveart@zipworld.com.au)
Date:	7/24/2002 10:25 AM
Subject:	Going loopy

Have a look at this loop and see what you reckon. As a Thermionic Fundamentalist loops aren't really my bag 😊 and I pretty much built it up out bits that were on the bench. Have a squizz [here](#)

This is the response with the return pot set flat (half rotation)...

50Hz= -1dB, 100Hz=0dB, 500Hz=1dB, 1kHz=1dB, 5kHz=0.9dB, 10kHz=0dB, 20kHz= -1.8dB, 40kHz= -4dB

The return pot will give a boost of 7dB at 1kHz.

It seems pretty transparent (the switch allows a complete bypass for comparison purposes - plus it sooths my soul somewhat 😊) I didn't worry too much about the topend roll off because I figure most FX gadgets would do that anyway.

Any comments? and feel free to have a tinker!

PeteR 😊

START NEW THREAD	REPLY	PREVIOUS	LIST
----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

Read 52 times

From:	Steve A. (steve_ahola@yahoo.com)
Date:	7/25/2002 7:46 AM
Subject:	Re: Going loopy

PeteR:

Looks great! I presume that you would be inserting it immediately before the PI... right? So in a 2204-style amp, the MV control would become the FX send level control and the FX return level control would then become the MV control (at least when the loop wasn't switched out). If someone were to add this to an amp that **doesn't** have a MV control immediately before the FX send, it might be a good idea to add one to the loop- maybe right before the 0.022uF cap going to the grid of V1? So the MV would not be in the circuit when the loop was switched out. Whaddaya think?

So how much signal reduction are you getting through the FX send buffer stage? In an unbuffered loop, the FX send can be way too hot and the output of the FX processor might not be sufficient to drive the output section to full power. So your loop might be a quick'n'dirty alternate to something more complicated (like a _umbleator).

--Thanks!

Steve Ahola

P.S. Can I upload your drawing to my site as loop1_valvearts.jpg? BTW would you tap the B+ from the PI supply? And what kind of tube are you using: a 12AX7 or a 12AT7?

START NEW THREAD	REPLY	PREVIOUS	LIST
----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

Read 46 times

From:	PeteR (valveart@zipworld.com.au)
Date:	7/25/2002 10:03 AM
Subject:	Re: Going loopy

Hi Steve,

I presume that you would be inserting it immediately before the PI... right? So in a 2204-style amp, the MV control would

become the FX send level control and the FX return level control would then become the MV control (at least when the loop wasn't switched out).

Yep, that's pretty much it, the MV control does control the send level.

*If someone were to add this to an amp that **doesn't** have a MV control immediately before the FX send, it might be a good idea to add one to the loop- maybe right before the 0.022uF cap going to the grid of V1? So the MV would not be in the circuit when the loop was switched out. Whaddaya think?*

That'd be one way of doing it...I'd try replacing the 4.7k in the cathode (split load?) with something like a 10k pot, or maybe increasing the 4.7k to 22k and sticking a 25k pot from it to ground so's the C/follower's operating parameters aren't changed by changing the send level. Watcha reckon?

So how much signal reduction are you getting through the FX send buffer stage?

Bugger, I forgot to measure that! (I'll measure it tomorrow and report back) I basically kept changing the bottom cathode resistor 'till I got the desired output swing from the return pot.

In an unbuffered loop, the FX send can be way too hot and the output of the FX processor might not be sufficient to drive the output section to full power. So your loop might be a quick'n'dirty alternate to something more complicated (like a _umbleator).

I know what you mean (been there, overdriven that 😊 - plus digital distortion must be one the ugliest sounds man has created!) I hope it is an alternative to the more complicated designs. I haven't tried any others so I couldn't comment, but I hope someone will give it a shot and let us know...

P.S. Can I upload your drawing to my site as loop1_valvearts.jpg? BTW would you tap the B+ from the PI supply? And what kind of tube are you using: a 12AX7 or a 12AT7?

Sure! Go for it! I'd be honoured 🙏 just drop the 's' from Valveart.

Ummm...the B+ is coming from the 1st node after the PI (dropped thru a 10k and filtered by a 47uF. I'll measure the actual voltages for you). I can't see any problem tapping off the PI B+.

I'm using a 12AX7 at the moment...I must give a 12AT7 shot!

PeteR 😊

START NEW THREAD	REPLY	PREVIOUS	LIST
Read 7 times			
From:	PeteR (valveart@zipworld.com.au)		
Date:	7/25/2002 10:59 PM		
Subject:	More measurements		

I've done some measuring....

The reduction in signal level thru the C/follower is -25.5dB (e.g. 6.4vp-p in, 0.34vp-p out)

The B+ in my rig is 236v.

maybe increasing the 4.7k to 22k and sticking a 25k pot from it to ground so's the C/follower's operating parameters aren't changed by changing the send level.

What I mean is place the 25k pot in parallel with the 22k resistor (duh 😊)

PeteR 😊

[START NEW THREAD](#)

[REPLY](#)

[PREVIOUS](#)

[LIST](#)

Read 1 time

From: Steve A. (steve_ahola@yahoo.com)

Date: 7/25/2002 11:09 PM

Subject: Re: More measurements

PeteR:

Sounds good to me! So have you tried your loop with both guitar level and line level effects?

--Thanks for the update!

Steve Ahola

