Mark Hadfield wrote:

>
> "Robert Stockwell" <rgs1967@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:3C59AAA6.4040802@hotmail.com...
>> Average time for time_test.pro = ...
>
> Isn't time_test deprecated these days in favour of time_test2? (The reason
> being, I believe, that the tests in the former are too small to be
> meaningful.) Time_test2 is the only one mentioned in the help file. There's
> also a time_test3 that seems to be the same as time_test2 except that some
> tests have been increased in size. JD's IDLSPEC2 benchmark uses time_test3
> so perhaps we should standardise on this.

The problem with time_test3 is that it's already antiquated. I've
several times sounded the battle cry for developing an updated IDL
benchmark which taxes machine subsystems adequately and independently
(not that it shouldn't use time_test* as a basis). For instance, the
sole I/O test in time_test* amounts to 256KB array read/writes -- well
within the cache of all modern drives and OS's. An entire dimension on
the IDLSPEC2 graph is thus rendered almost useless. I have collected a
list of volunteers for constructing this community benchmark, and
eagerly solicit more. Depending on interest, an expanded 3D Graphics
benchmark might also be developed in parallel.

IDLSPEC3 has been dragging along primarily due to this stumbling block.
If people are interested in contributing their thoughts and ideas
concerning a more robust, community-developed test suite, then by all
means, contact me.

Having just completed a 3000 mile move, it may be some time yet before
you see the light in IDLSPEC3's eyes, but if we pull together, it will
be worth it. And for those whose arms I twisted as volunteers, don't
think I've lost your names ;)

JD