Subject: Re: Sorry Re: which OS is faster for idl?
Posted by JD Smith on Fri, 24 Oct 2003 22:12:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 24 Oct 2003 09:45:10 -0700, Rick Towler wrote:

> "JD Smith" wrote ...
>> On Thu, 23 Oct 2003 16:42:59 -0700, Karl Schultz wrote:
>>
>>
>>> "R.G. Stockwell" wrote ...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> A while ago I came to a similar conclusion. A 1.13 ghx win2000
>>>> laptop was faster than my 1.4 ghz linux AMD. There must be compiler
>>>> optimizations available on the ms platforms that are not there on
>>>> the other platfforms.
>>>>
>>>>
>>> Agreed.
>>>
>>> I ran the same tests on my dual-boot (XP/RedHat 8.0 2.4 kernel) and
>>> measured linux to be about 15% slower.
>>>
>>> So, it is a pretty fair bet that the quality of the compiled code,
>>> efficiency of function parameter passing conventions, and speed of
>>> the runtime library are probable contributors to the observed
>>> difference.
>
>
>> This seems to me to be almost entirely a compiler issue. I know you
>> use very few of gcc's built-in optimizations: have you investigated
>> whether this speed disparity can be mitigated or reversed with more
>> aggressive optimization on the Linux side?
>
> Does RSI really use gcc to build IDL for linux? If so, the majority of
> the difference could be attributed to the unoptimized code it generates.
> Even when you invoke gcc's optimizations it lags far behind the Intel
> and Portland Group compilers for Linux.
>
>
As far as I know, yes. I think the idea is that this would allow DLM's to
be built with minimum fuss using the most popular freely available
compiler for the platform. Note that gcc 3.4, due out in the near future,
is supposed to be much improved when it comes to optimization performance.

JD