
Subject: Re: Upp package binding for LLVM/Clang library (libclang)

Posted by [Sender Ghost](#) on Sat, 14 Jul 2012 19:54:52 GMT

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

tojocky wrote on Sat, 14 July 2012 20:49 Did you test on performance?

The AddressBook example (r5188), Optimal build, on Windows XP:

- TDM MinGW GCC v4.6.1:

AddressBook.exe (2508288 B) linked in (0:03.12)

OK. (3:26.01)

- Nuwen MinGW GCC v4.7.0:

AddressBook.exe (2520064 B) linked in (0:01.62)

OK. (4:02.50)

- Clang v3.1 with diagnostics:

AddressBook.exe (2880512 B) linked in (0:01.28)

OK. (2:49.35)

Note: The IDE freezes for some time, after linking stage.

- Clang v3.1 without diagnostics:

AddressBook.exe (2880512 B) linked in (0:01.25)

OK. (2:43.45)

- MSC9 compiler:

AddressBook.exe (1243136 B) linked in (0:02.21)

OK. (1:53.06)

Other related topics:

- "Clang - Performance", "Clang vs Other Open Source Compilers" on clang.llvm.org.

- "GCC 4.6/4.7 vs. LLVM-Clang 3.0/3.1 Compilers" on phoronix.com.

- "Clang vs GCC for Linux Development: Compare and Contrast" on stackoverflow.com.

Edit: Added some results on Windows XP.
