

On 9 Mai, 20:34, Pierre <pierre.villene...@gmail.com> wrote:

```
> Hi Samuel,
>
> I saw a very similar problem with my quad-core PC running XP (32 bit)
> with 4gigs of ram. I re-ran my test script on our two-core, 4-gig
> linux box and got similar results with just slightly different array
> sizes. Here is the script I ran:
>
> cpu, /reset
>
> help, !cpu, /str
>
> Nk = 258
> K = fltarr(Nk, Nk)
>
> ;
> ; Case 1.
> ;
> Npix = 129047
> d = fltarr(Npix, Nk)
> t0 = systime(1)
>
> d #= K
>
> t1 = systime(1) - t0
>
> print, 'Case #1: ', Npix, t1
>
> ;
> ; Case 2.
> ;
> Npix = Npix + 1
> d = fltarr(Npix, Nk)
> t0 = systime(1)
>
> d #= K
>
> t2 = systime(1) - t0
>
> print, 'Case #2: ', Npix, t2
>
> On each of our computers case #2 used all available cores while case
> #1 only used one core. The only difference between them is the
> dimension of one of the arrays (Npix) is simply incremented by one.
```

- > The total memory used by the IDL process during this test is never
- > more and two-hundred megs or so. There is no way this problem is due
- > to a lack of physical memory. The sizes of these arrays are also
- > significantly larger then the default minimum number of elements
- > (default = 10000) required to enable multi-threading.
- >
- > Any ideas?
- > Pierre

It's not a Windows Problem. We have the same Problem also with Ubuntu...

---