help-linux wrote on Fri, 28 July 2006 05:11it maby fast to you, but amd users will probably think it is slow. amd processors have allways been one step ahead of intell.
some people think that the speed of the processor EG 2.7 GHz is how fast it will be but that is wrong.

from what i understand about how they work, processors have something called registers and the more registers a processor has the faster it will be.

a register performs commands that the operating system gives it.
amd have an advanced command system on their registers, intell have only a simple set of commands.

also from what i have heard, intell processors have 16 registers, amd have 32.

that is why amd processors are known to get hot. it is also why amd processors are so much faster than intell processors.

to me, intell processors are not too bad. but i have noticed that they are very bad a mulititasking. but running one or two programs is ok.

Listen, I've been a fan of AMD since three years ago. I think their CPUs are really good, and that intel has failed to compete for ages. But I'm sorry, your response is quite ignorant, for you have not even done a bit of research on the Core 2 Duo. I'm not going to be like a lot of AMD fans and still stick with AMD even if the other side is doing better. I KNOW that the faster the GHz doesn't mean the better. Nobody believes that these days, so I have no idea why you assume I do. One of the Core 2 Duo processors, known as the E6600, beats the Athlon FX-62 in just about everything, and that processor is supposed to be priced around $300 (it'll probably end up a little above that). I'm not just following benchmarks either. Its technology is more advanced, and many articles explain it well and how it's more efficient. I'm not going to rate processors only by "registers". You can if you want, but have fun getting shafted while I enjoy a great processor.

and just so you know, this time intel is one step ahead of AMD.