Subject: Re: Major Draw refactoring
Posted by Novo on Fri, 17 Jul 2009 21:54:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Fri, 17 July 2009 11:43Novo wrote on Fri, 17 July 2009 11:24luzr wrote on Fri, 17 July 2009 08:18

If yes, you can use dynamic_cast<DrawingDraw *>.

Is it really necessary to use RTTI with UPP? It makes code bigger and used only at very limited number of places in UPP. Avoiding RTTI (and exceptions) would attract small platform users.

Sorry for the offtopic.

RTTI is valid part of C++ standard and while minor feature, it has a nice ability to automatically provide solution to problems similiar to this one.

I do not believe that it makes code *significantly* bigger. There is not that much to store in memory in order to support RTTI (AFAIK).

Mirek

of overhead because of RTTI (you can see at least mangled names in data sections). This

give much bigger overhead.

During research of this topic I found a very interesting article:
http://connect.microsoft.com/VisualStudio/feedback/ViewFeedb ack.aspx?FeedbackID=471325

executable but increases run-time memory consumption. This explains why all windows applications require so much memory .

Probably, MINGW is not that bad after all.

TheIDE according to dumpbin:

Summary

142000 .data
172000 .rdata
1000 .rsrc
257000 .text

SECTION HEADER #3
.data name
1412FC virtual size
3CA000 virtual address (007CA000 to 0090B2FB)
34000 size of raw data
3CA000 file pointer to raw data (003CA000 to 003FDFFF)
0 file pointer to relocation table
0 file pointer to line numbers
0 number of relocations
0 number of line numbers
C0000040 flags
Initialized Data
Read Write

Summary

142000 .data

The ".data" segment is 13% of the ".text" segment. Not all ".data" is RTTI but still ...
And for some reason it requires 55% of ".text"'s size at run-time.

Any way, small device guys always compile with RTTI disabled.