
Subject: Re: Sound Cards.

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sat, 10 May 2008 13:01:38 GMT

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

Chuck Norris wrote on Sat, 10 May 2008 07:08Goztow wrote on Thu, 08 May 2008 01:42But you won't gain FPS between a 10 € dedicated soundcard and a 100 € one. Not entirely true. It depends on if the sound card is hardware accelerated if it'll lighten the load on the CPU or not. If both cards are hardware accelerated, then yes it's mostly true that the more expensive one won't give much better results performance-wise, but if one is not hardware accelerated, it may as well not be there (since the workload is still on the CPU and not hardware accelerated on the card). Yes, cards do exist that aren't hardware accelerated. I'm not 100% positive, but I hear the Sound Blaster Live 24-bit (now known as the Audigy SE) isn't hardware accelerated (the original Sound Blaster Live cards were hardware accelerated though). Most cheap cards aren't hardware accelerated, or are very minimally.

Onboard sound these days is really good. Two to three years back and prior, a sound card was worth it, but it's less and less so these days. I used to swear by sound cards, but my new motherboard came with a sound card (which can be considered onboard probably since I doubt it's hardware accelerated) and after hearing it, I look at the price tag of a new X-Fi Gamer and say it probably isn't worth it.

Indeed. There was actually a onboard soundcard known for good/better performance than dedicated PCI Sound cards.

At the time it was just as good as the dedicated Audigy if not better.

http://www.nvidia.com/object/feature_soundstorm.html
