Subject: Poly test Posted by PaRaDoX on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 23:23:45 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

well i have noticed alot of people saying stuff like "1900 polys is way to much for that" and they people say "what about the older computers, they wont handle that much" well i am one of those people with an older computer so a ran a test and heres the specks and test

system specs 900MHz AMD Duron OC 1.1ghz 64kb of L2 cache 384mb of pc2100 100mhz OC 133mhz 266mhz effective Radon 9250se 256mb 238mhz core 166mhz VRAM OC to 422mhz effective VRAM 128bit 4 pipelines mother board ECS K7VTA3 Rev 6.2

heres the test

heres the frame rate i get at the menu

heres the frame rate i got in game

heres the frame rate when i started shooting and set of some c4

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by Sir Phoenixx on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 23:43:00 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That wasn't necessary, it was already tested before, someone put a bunch of high detail tanks and got the polygon count into the millions and had it in game with little FPS loss. The game handles larger numbers of polygons well, but doesn't handle larger textures as good.

So yes, "what about the older computers, they wont handle that much" is false.

But the first quote has nothing to do with that, 1930 is WAY too much for a model that small, that beacon can be done in less then half of that with the same amount of detail if done right.

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by PaRaDoX on Mon, 16 Jan 2006 23:47:22 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message yea i could be but it does not have to be 800 polys and i dont think they are going to cut the faces out of the parts you cant see... if they did that it would be around 1100

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by sfr3f on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 03:31:10 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

How often do you see untextured objects in game? Now try it with game-scale textures.

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by Chronojam on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 04:13:39 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

PaRaDoX wrote on Mon, 16 January 2006 18:47yea i could be but it does not have to be 800 polys

and i dont think they are going to cut the faces out of the parts you cant see... if they did that it would be around 1100

It doesn't have to be over 1000 polygons. It SHOULD be way less than it is. It's unprofessional to invest additional polygons when you gain absolutely no detail, and a waste.

Renegade handles polygons wonderfully but it's not so good about wrapping large textures over them. Some engines are good at polys, some are good at textures; Renegade is great with polygons in the order of millions of visible ones on-screen, but as soon as you stick 1024x1024 textures on them...

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by PaRaDoX on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 04:39:46 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

KaiserPanda wrote on Mon, 16 January 2006 22:31How often do you see untextured objects in game? Now try it with game-scale textures. how may game models are biger then 4000 polys?

and yes cj they did waste a bunch on it, those details could have been added with a good bump map too

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by Chronojam on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 05:45:47 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message I'm sure they'll reduce it and have it still look as great as it does, but you shouldn't try to defend the overuse of polygons especially using this old truth about Renegade (that it handles polygons great). By the way, what's with you talking about bumpmaps all the time suddenly? o_O

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by PaRaDoX on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 19:34:22 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

well they add details without ploys and if they could make a good bump map it would look great

see

this is what it looks like without the base texture

Subject: Re: Poly test Posted by Nodbugger on Tue, 17 Jan 2006 21:47:11 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Me and Doitle did this what? 5 years ago?

Page 3 of 3 ---- Generated from Command and Conquer: Renegade Official Forums