
Subject: Re: Sorry Re: which OS is faster for idl?
Posted by [Karl Schultz](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2003 23:42:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"R.G. Stockwell" <noemail@please.com> wrote in message
news:0RTIb.1644\$4V5.19167@news.uswest.net...

>
>>> Yunxiang Zhang writes:
>>>
>>>> I happened to have a chance to run a time_test on a multiboot
machine
>>>> today. I did time_test, time_test2 & time_test3.
> Linux(gentoo,2.4.20-r6
>>>> kernel for P4) is 20~30% slower than XP. What do you guys think of
> this?
>>>> Any similar test has been done by anyone of you?
>
>
> 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 platforms.
>

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.

Dual boot machines are great for tests like these because they keep a lot of
the variables constant and you therefore don't have to apply CPU clock speed
adjustments and wonder about differences between cache sizes, CPU
architecture, and other chipset issues.

I also compared the times on linux with and without an X server running and,
as expected, it made no significant difference.

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.

Karl
