

Re: How does compare gcc to VS C++ ?

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.misc/2004-08/0983.html>

From: Jason Bowen (*no_at_spam.net*)

Date: 08/12/04

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2004 10:00:35 -0600

John-Paul Stewart wrote:

> *Jason Bowen wrote:*

>

>> *John-Paul Stewart wrote:*

>>

>>> *Jason Bowen wrote:*

>>>

>>>> *John-Paul Stewart wrote:*

>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> *Then explain to me how you can be certain the observed performance*

>>>>> *difference can be attributed solely to code generation.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *It's easy. A compiler can base it's code generation off of a*

>>>> *target. The knowledge of the target of the compiler builder can*

>>>> *vary. A compiler can be smart enough to know how to order*

>>>> *instructions better to enhance cache access or minimize latency*

>>>> *between instructions based on how long it takes a particular*

>>>> *instruction to complete.*

>>>

>>>

>>> *So you're not talking about an *observed* performance difference*

>>> *based on running the generated code. You're talking about a*

>>> **calculated* performance difference based on reading the generated*

>>> *code and calculating latencies, etc. Correct?*

>>

>>

>> *I was never comparing an executable running under Windows to one*

>> *running under Linux. I was talking about the difference in code*

>> *generated by a couple of compilers. I'm thinking in terms of flat x86*

>> *instructions.*

>

>

> *That's all well and good if all you care about is theoretical*

> *performance, but real-word performance is influenced by far more factors*

> *than this one. And that's been my point all along.*

comp.os.linux.misc: Re: How does compare gcc to VS C++ ?

The initial question was about compilers. It wasn't specific and poorly asked but it can be a valid question to directly compare the compilers.

You're right about real-world performance but in the real world Windows isn't the abomination that everybody always wants to make it out to be. I run 2000 for work because I had 4 blue screens in XP in a year. I've never had 2000 die on me, not an exaggeration nor does it invalidate any problems others may have had. The last time I had Linux crash on me was circa 1997 running a 1.2.13 kernel. All my consoles went zombie on me and I had to manually power the machine off. I'll go with one crash in 7 years :-).