

## Re: tak quality SCT?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-05/msg00936.html>

---

- *From:* [mmd49@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mmd49@xxxxxxxxxx) (Mark D)
  - *Date:* Fri, 13 May 2005 18:14:56 -0600
- 

I looked through an AP Mak Cas once.

Maybe it was just me, but I was far more impressed at the AP 1200 mount than the OTA.....

Allan

---

Perhaps so, especially, if you were at a star party, and just before looking through the AP Mak, you looked through a 20" Dob?

I'll admit, I've seen this once too, at one Astrofest, just coming from a friend's Compustar 14, and then looking through the AP 10" Mak (Roland's own personal scope, perhaps the Prototype)

Yes, I'm sure I saw a little more nebulosity in the C-14 looking at DSO's such as the Lagoon, and Trifid nebulas vs the AP 10" Mak, but I also did recognize too, the much tighter star images, and high contrast that was at hand through the AP.

The differences were subtle, and after running back, and forth a few times, you begin to recognize the quality of the AP Mak. Individual stars did appear a bit more "bloated" through the C-14. For visual use, this may not seem quite so important, but for imaging, I'm sure this makes all the difference in the world.

Another feature of the AP Mak. No mirror "Flop", and no Focuser "Slop". Roland didn't cut any corners in these areas.

Bear in mind, that the C-14 has a mirror 4" larger in Diameter. Also the fact that this test was done under what I call mediocre conditions at an Astrofest 15 miles away from Kankakee, Ill. at the time.

I see no reason why a high quality SCT with superb wavefront quality cannot be competitive to a high quality Maksutov.

As I mentioned earlier, there are other variants of the SCT that I'm sure could have a better wider corrected field versus the average run of the mill commercial SCT.

The current SCT's are quite light, and are good performers, but in my opinion, lack in a few minor areas. Yes, a little more time spent on better matching, and figuring of Optics would go a long way to putting

Re: tak quality SCT?

these scopes into a more consistent high quality. What if Celestron and Meade spent an additional week to get Optics 'just right". What could this cost? Another \$1K?

Also, the mechanics could have improvements.

The biggest gripes, and shortcomings I see, are inadequate, relatively flimsy focusing mechanisms, and their outdated design, and Primary Baffle Tubes/Mirror supports, which could be made to higher quality designs, and tolerances. What could this cost? Another \$500 tops? The present focusers in Commercial SCT's must cost the manufacturers a whopping \$5 apiece! Take a look if you can, at an AP 10" Mak's Focusing mechanism. A hell of a big difference.

If a Celestron C11 had 1/10 wave final wavefront optics, what good would it be, if the scope still exhibits focuser slop, and mirror flop? Mark D.

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: tak quality SCT?*

◇ *From: RichA*

◆ *Re: tak quality SCT?*

◇ *From: AM*

• Prev by Date: *Re: Inaccurate starchart ?*

• Next by Date: *AP900, Titan or Tak NJP*

• Previous by thread: *Re: tak quality SCT?*

• Next by thread: *Re: tak quality SCT?*

• Index(es):

◆ *Date*

◆ *Thread*