
Subject: Re: Summary: "time_test" for IDL on Windows systems

Posted by [fskmjm](#) on Mon, 20 Mar 1995 07:30:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <D5Jt9u.70v@nwra.com> mark@nwra.com (Mark Baldwin) writes:

> The following is a summary of the responses I received in response to
> my post concerning the IDL benchmark "time_test" on Windows and NT
> systems:

> System: Gateway 90MHz Pentium, 32Mb RAM, Windows for workgroups.

> IDL 3.6.1: 15.59 seconds

> 1st Beta IDL 4.0: 11.23 seconds

> 2nd Beta IDL 4.0: ~16.8 seconds

> System: 486-DX2 66MHz 8Mb RAM IDL 3.6.1: 47.74 seconds.

> An error occurred in test #15, resulting in 0.0 seconds for that test.

> System: 90MHz Pentium, 32Mb RAM, Windows for Workgroups 3.11

> IDL 3.6.1: 16.4 - 16.6 seconds.

> Same system except Gateway 90MHz w/ very fast disk: 14.2 seconds

> System: 486/33MHz Windows 3.1

> IDL 3.1.2: 73.71 seconds.

> -----

> For comparison, my Sparc 10/41 takes 21 seconds.

> The Pentium systems are faster, but there are a few points to be cautious
> about. Disk speed becomes relatively important with the fast systems. Also,
> you will need to run time_test a few times because it gets faster after the
> first try.

> The big question concerns the two beta versions of IDL 4.0. The first beta is
> much faster than 3.6.1, while the second beta is actually slower. Let's hope
> RSI keeps the speed of the first beta in the 4.0 release, which is due in late
> spring or early summer. Can anyone familiar with these beta versions explain
> these speed differences?

> Has anyone run the NT version of IDL on a Pentium system?

> -Mark Baldwin

> mark@nwra.com

I find on my 486DX2 with 8MB RAM, Windows 3.1, IDL ver 3.5.1 that the test
is very sensitive to the size of my output window. Does this make sense?????
