Subject: Re: SMP experiences with IDL
Posted by davidf on Wed, 25 Feb 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Kirt Schaper (xxx@some.place.org) writes:

> Here are some timing results from a simple benchmark program
> (the program simply generated a 100x100x50 random float array
> and convolved it with a 10x10x10 kernel). I know that elapsed
> time is not a very precise benchmark, but the systems were all
> unloaded at the time of the test, and elapsed time is what makes
> a system usable or not.
>
> ; idl version 4.01
> ; SS10/51 (50MHz) -------------- elapsed time = 59.1 seconds
> ; Dec 600 5/266 (266MHz) ------- elapsed time = 43.0 seconds
> ; HP 9000 C180 (180MHz) -------- elapsed time = 19.7 seconds
> ; Pentium Pro (200MHz), Linux -- elapsed time = 12.1 seconds
> ; Pentium II (300MHz), Linux --- elapsed time = 9.0 seconds
> ;
> ; idl version 5.0
> ; SS10/51 (50MHz) -------------- elapsed time =138.6 seconds
> ; Pentium Pro (200MHz), Linux -- elapsed time = 45.0 seconds
> ; HP 9000 C180 (180MHz) -------- elapsed time = 33.7 seconds
> ; Pentium II (300MHz), Linux --- elapsed time = 31.3 seconds
>
> I find several things interesting about the above experience.
>
> (2) RSI did something quite bad to the convolution function
> from v4 to v5.

I spoke to RSI about this recently. They are aware of the
problem and apparently have it fixed, if the data I recently
saw from an IDL 5.1 beta is any indication. The numbers are
back in line with the numbers for IDL 4.0.

Apparently those guys have the same problem I do. You get
a bright idea in the middle of the night about a program,
but it turns out to be not-so-bright when it's implemented
on a client's machine. Sigh...

Oh, well. At least I don't have 25,000 people looking over
MY shoulder. :-)

Cheers,

David

David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting
E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com
Phone: 970-221-0438
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/