

---

Subject: : AmigaOS4

Topic: : SDL2

Re: SDL2

Author: : kas1e

Date: : 2020/1/25 20:36:53

URL:

@Capehill

I made a small test via "testdraw2.exe" coming with sdl2, and:

Pegasos2 with Radeon9250:

```
testdraw2 --render software: 64fps
```

```
testdraw2 --render opengl: 114fps
```

```
testdraw2 --render compositing: 264fps
```

X5000 RadeonHD:

```
testdraw2 --render software: 288fps
```

```
testdraw2 --render opengl: 400fps
```

```
testdraw2 --render compositing: 600fps
```

I.e. all the time, compositing is faster than OpenGL. And fast for about 2 times (exactly the figures I have with DOSBox when using OpenGL -> all slows on 40-50%)

What I want to understand is why compositing is that faster? I mean, why for example minigl/warp3d (and as well as warp3dnova), haven't used "compositing in some parts if it faster. I.e. be OpenGL, just use compositing inside for things where it will be faster.

Just such a massive difference... Can it be luck of DMA for example?

On win32, at least in DOSBox, be it opengl, or ddraw, FPS are the same (as expected).

Can anybody explain why OpenGL vs compositing should be that slow when it comes to simple texture drawing?