



Letter the e

Low distortion oscillator

I thought I'd drop D.E. Graham of Wembley Downs, WA, and N.V. of Parramatta a supportive line, through your column.

They are not alone in experiencing that frustrating problem with the frequency calibration of the Low Distortion Oscillator. I'm experiencing the same characteristics as D.E.G. described, in his letter to you published in the November 1987 issue. My kit was also from the same supplier. I checked the "pot" for linearity and tracking before installing and it was OK. I've also done the same work around as D.E.G.

I didn't like your comment (inference) that you "doubt if it could have been fitted with a antilog pot (i.e., prototype), or there would have been many more complaints beside yourself (D.E.G.) and N.V."

Surely a bit of maths (haven't had time yet to do it) would resolve this without the above hypothesis being offered; the two events — given human nature — aren't that strongly linked.

Enough of this brickbat — please put my letter in the same file as N.V.'s and D.G.'s — maybe the file will get bigger.

Len Bray,
Aranda, ACT.

Comment: Thanks for writing, Len. My earlier comment wasn't meant to be rude, just an observation. We've had further discussions with the kit supplier concerned, as all the problems with this project do seem to have been with their kits. The only conclusion we can reach at present is that one batch of pots may have had a subtly different resistance/rotation law, or perhaps a different angular rotation range (perhaps 300° instead of 270°).

All we can suggest is that if you have this calibration problem, try judicious changes to the values of the series and shunt resistors associated with both sections of VR5.