

---

Subject: Re: Inverse palette conversion algorithm...  
Posted by [mr\\_ped](#) on Mon, 10 Apr 2006 15:58:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I did some benchmark on "old" Athlon 1GHz, and your old code is almost 3 times faster than my "supposed to be faster" code!  
(original benchmark with my code being 2 times faster was from Celeron 2GHz)

That's ridiculous, I think that can't be the data cache trashing anymore, but I didn't have time to work on it more and figure out what's happening.

But having such simple code so significantly faster/slower on different CPU did really surprise, I was expecting like 50% speed differences between AMD vs Intel and different cache sizes.

Anyway, I did have time to *\*think\** about it, and I can assure you the code I posted is just a mere "proof of concept". I didn't had time to try all those optimisations yet if they are correct - but if they are, expect some surprises and some more coding tricks. (and IMHO really nice ones )

Especially the above mentioned bottleneck of large Vector[] table will be removed to the extend I didn't even dream it was possible.

I think I will be back with improved version in 2-3 days, when I will have some time to sit behind my home PC and try all those ideas.

So far I have a little programmer's quiz here:

How will I make the "feed\_me" array about 100 times smaller without any really "dirty" trick or major algorithm change?  
(the code will change considerably, but the basic idea of the whole code will remain same)

---