

---

Subject: Re: My new computer

Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Tue, 10 Oct 2006 23:42:26 GMT

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

---

Blazer wrote on Fri, 25 August 2006 17:04I have zero desire for a quad core, and neither should anyone else who isnt doing graphics rendering or something like that. Quad cores are designed for servers, not gaming machines.

I play games with about a dozen or two programs in the background. Quad core processors are for me.

Not to mention that games can in fact make use of more than two cores

#1: working on current frame's physics

#2 (one step behind #1): working on current frame's graphics

#3: actively loading needed data, passively loading data that could be needed soon

any additional cores could work on AI processing (imagine having 16 cores... that'd give you some 12 cores for AI... most games can put about 16 bots per CPU with no decrease in framerate, so imagine games of 192 bots... lol)

an alternate setup would be to keep the physics core one step ahead of player processing, you could then have additional cores processing players' movements instead of AI movements... no more lag when you have 50+ people in the game. that is, unless your GPU sucks.

---