Subject: Re: Linux Help Needed
Posted by JD Smith on Sat, 28 Jan 2006 01:55:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 27 Jan 2006 19:47:53 +0000, Greg Hennessy wrote:

> On 2006-01-27, Nigel Wade <nmw@ion.le.ac.uk> wrote:
>> It seems that the Intel Macs are not all that Apple would like you to believe:
>>
>> http://www.macworld.com/2006/01/features/imaclabtest1/index. php
>
> Not that I have a dog in this fight, since I use Linux on opterons,
> but a different viewpoint can be found at:
>
> http://www.macspeedzone.com/html/hardware/machine/performanc
e_in_the_raw/06/1_23.shtml

My strong impression is that, for large arrays (say 200,000 elements and more), the MacBook should be around 4-5 times faster at basic processing in IDL (not reading/writing to disk, drawing to screen, etc, but FFT's, arithmetic, etc.) than the Powerbook G4's they replace. In fact I'd be willing to make a wager to this effect.

Each core of the Core Duo is about as fast as a G5. If you are hammering away at both cores, you'll really embarrass your old PB. I expect *very* similar performance for Linux laptops with the Core Duo and the MacBook: same compiler, very similar libraries, same processor, same memory sub-system, etc. Macs may lag a bit due to the extra overhead of function calls, but it should be close. It will be nice not to suffer the "PPC" penalty under IDL (though we lament the unrealized potential which was Altivec).

Macworld's test was something of a joke. Though useful, because it reflects real world typical-use performance, we could easily design benchmarks in IDL which actually stress the dual CPU cores to their maximum, and we would find much different results. Here's a hint. This is not a CPU benchmark:

IDL> openw,un,/get_lun & writeu,un,lindgen(10000000L) & free_lun,un

JD