
Subject: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Thu, 11 Aug 2005 23:46:32 GMT


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

Erm...I have the ATI Radeon 9200 SE as most of you know and there are these two PCI settings that I have no clue what they are. It is called PCI write. And I can turn it on or off. Here is the screenshot:

Will turning this off improve my GFX performance? Or would this be bad for my computer? And if also could someone explain what exactly it is so I can learn a little about it?

File Attachments

1) [ss101.JPG](#), downloaded 907 times



Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 00:03:03 GMT

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

Delete your WINDOWS folder, k?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [deerwalk](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 00:05:51 GMT

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

j4S[p wrote on Thu, 11 August 2005 19:03]Delete your WINDOWS folder, k?
I tried it it works

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [csskiller](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 00:09:18 GMT

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

here's a tip don't screw around with anything you don't know about
Either:

- a) leave it alone
 - b) google it or something
 - c) apparently people are tired of helping you
-

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 00:13:15 GMT

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

I guess.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 06:34:13 GMT

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

The 9200SE sucks totally anyways, you couldn't expect anything to boost its speed.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 07:00:26 GMT

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

True, but at the moment it works for me and runs all my games fine. Hopefully I can get a new one sometime soon.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Weirdo](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 17:15:57 GMT

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

I think the help baloon explains it quite well.

If you turn the read function off. No PCI device (although this sounds quite extreme) can use the computers RAM memory. I don't know how this works, but I would advise not to turn it off.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 19:23:15 GMT

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

You think it may run fine, but there is a LOT you're missing out on. I know that for sure because I'm missing out on a LOT with my current video card (Geforce FX 5600). I'm trying to save up for a 6800.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Homey](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 19:39:47 GMT

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

my 6600 GT runs everything amazingly, although some of the shaders are gay It was worth the 250\$ (Canadian)

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 19:42:27 GMT

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

I honestly think my GeForce 6800 GT 256Mb isn't that great. I get about 50 fps on medium setting on css with a 2.6GHz Processor and 1gb pci2700 DDR RAM (333MHz)

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 20:25:12 GMT

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

DJM wrote on Fri, 12 August 2005 14:42I honestly think my GeForce 6800 GT 256Mb isn't that great. I get about 50 fps on medium setting on css with a 2.6GHz Processor and 1gb pci2700 DDR RAM (333MHz)

Then obviously something is wrong. It's not the video card, I can tell you that for sure.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 22:06:05 GMT

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

Processor? Too Slow?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 22:31:29 GMT

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

The thing is...I may have to get a whole new motherboard to get anything better than my 9200 SE. Since I only have PCI. I will have to do some searching up to do.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 22:45:40 GMT

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

To the top question. What it probably does is force PCI devices to access memory by REFERENCE, not by value (which is reading directly from RAM). Reading by reference is GOOD because it saves using more ram unnecessarily. can't remember much more about it, been a while since I read that visual basic book which explained it. By the way, I have the same card as you. have you read the documentation for these drivers which might explain it better?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 22:48:26 GMT

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

I bought the card from my neighbor so I will have to go back over there and get the manual from him if he still has it.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 23:30:39 GMT

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

DJM wrote on Fri, 12 August 2005 18:06Processor? Too Slow?

I highly doubt it. I have an Athlon XP 2600 2.1GHz CPU, maybe a little faster than your CPU, and I get better results in CS:S than you with my video card.

Could be cooling issues? Can you check the temperature on your video card?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Lijitsu](#) on Fri, 12 Aug 2005 23:35:10 GMT

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

Perhaps Defrag the computer every week, like your supposed to? Or atleast every other week?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Sat, 13 Aug 2005 00:33:17 GMT

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

Well I Defrag every 6 moths so maybe I better change that habbit.

My comp has two case fans along with two PSU fans and a fan on the processor and the graphics card, it's pretty cool in there.

However my motherboard is over 4 years old. Maybe that's the problem?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 13 Aug 2005 07:47:35 GMT

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

Lijitsu wrote on Fri, 12 August 2005 18:35Perhaps Defrag the computer every week, like your supposed to? Or atleast every other week?

Fragmented files BARELY affect the FPS in games, unless you have a small ass hard drive.

DJM wrote on Fri, 12 August 2005 19:33However my motherboard is over 4 years old. Maybe that's the problem?

That could possibly be it, but which motherboard do you have?

Here's another idea; search Google for CoolBits and read how to unlock it. Once you unlock it, go into your nVIDIA display properties and look for "Clock Frequency Settings". Click on it and check manual overclocking. Press OK or whatever when it warns you, and then press the button "Detect Optimal Frequencies". It will take a little while, then when it finishes make sure you check "Apply these settings at startup" (NOTE: This will NOT void your warranty). Now, tell me the MHz of both the core and memory, or just take a screenshot.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sat, 13 Aug 2005 12:40:24 GMT

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

DJM wrote on Fri, 12 August 2005 15:42I honestly on a 2.6GHz Processor and 1gb pci2700 DDR RAM (333MHz)

Here's your problem there ^

first of all, I think you mean a p4 2.66 ghz with DDR333 or your saying 2.6 ghz in AMD rating well, it's actually like 2 ghz.

Your fast video card is to fast for your other component's so it doesn't get to its max. if you have a Athlon XP or p4D under 3ghz+

It's kinda a waste buying such a good card because the card cant reach its full potential. If you want it to run at its full look more in the way of a AMD 64 3500+ or p4 3.8Ghz

Still a verry good gfx card though.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sat, 13 Aug 2005 13:26:11 GMT

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

JPNOD wrote on Sat, 13 August 2005 08:40

Here's your problem there ^

first of all, I think you mean a p4 2.66 ghz with DDR333 or your saying 2.6 ghz in AMD rating well, it's actually like 2 ghz.

Well, if he meant a Pentium, then 2600 Mhz should be enough to get better results. If he meant AMD 2600 Mhz it's DEFINETLY enough, as even a Athlon "2600+" should be enough...I have 2800+ OC'd to 3000+ which runs at 2090 Mhz, 6800 GT GS, 1,5 Gb of RAM and get 65+ FPS in CS:S in 1600*1200 resolution and full details. The difference isn't that big so his system should do better. I think it's either his motherboard, or a problem with software (drivers, system config.)

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sat, 13 Aug 2005 21:04:15 GMT

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

If it's a AMD 64... Athlon XP = like a AMD Sempron it's mid range right now. And does it can NOT give the full potential a GF6800 needs a GT6600 would be a better choice here imo. Also DDR333 the chance is so big he is running a Pentium 4 2.66 with DDR333 quad pumped FSB533 A Athlon XP does outrun that with like 4 fps in games. But a P4C 800fsb is faster then the XP if he has that it should be ok but like I said the above if he has that its not fast enough to keep pace with the GF6800.

Every 2 month's there like a New GFX and then if you look at cpu's it doesn't go that fast.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 14 Aug 2005 05:38:25 GMT

You're a little lost, JPNOD. For one thing, there is no Athlon that is above 3.0GHz unless you overclock it, and secondly, his CPU can't affect the performance his video card should give so greatly. If you read what I said earlier, I'm getting better performance with a much worse video card and a pretty equivalent processor, which shows that your information is pretty flawed. His CPU cannot affect his video card so dramatically like that unless he had something like a 1GHz Pentium III. It is obviously something else.

DJM, I suggest doing what I asked in my last post so that we can troubleshoot this.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sun, 14 Aug 2005 11:40:34 GMT

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

Ok in rating there is. When I mean a 3+ ghz I meant the cpu with a rating +3ghz a p4 3ghz is basically a AMD XP 3200 or 3000 unless were talking about a AMD 64 here it's a different story. it's getting vague for the costumer anyways because now a days there is like 3/4 cores for each cpu with the same 3000+ If I hardly know the difference how would a n00b costumer now? Put a AMD Sempron/Axp against a AMD 64 with a GF6800 and your fps will be significant lower. I didn't say his system is configured right or wrong. I just expect he configured it in the right way.

The only way to test this is by putting in a slower GFX card. If the fps is the same it means his other pc components are running behind the graphics card.

Also try a fresh Windows Install + various of drivers..

And may post your other system spec's too. Saying a 4 years old mobo. If it has a slow chip the problem lies there.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 14 Aug 2005 17:53:29 GMT

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

JPNOD wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 06:40Put a AMD Sempron/Axp against a AMD 64 with a GF6800 and your fps will be significant lower.

Yes, but not that dramatically.

JPNOD wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 06:40

The only way to test this is by putting in a slower GFX card. If the fps is the same it means his other pc components are running behind the graphics card.

If you read my last post, I stated that I have a lot slower of a video card with a pretty equivalent processor and I get better performance than him.

JPNOD wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 06:40

And may post your other system spec's too. Saying a 4 years old mobo. If it has a slow chip the problem lies there.

My motherboard is about three years old. The motherboard is the ultimate least of his problems, since motherboards barely affect the speed of the computer.

Athlon XP 2600+ 2.1GHz 333MHz FSB
1024MB DDR PC2700
Gainward Geforce FX 5600 256MB
MSI D7N2 Delta-L Motherboard
Western Digital 80GB 7200RPM

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Sun, 14 Aug 2005 22:07:23 GMT

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

Well they might not be the most important part there is but saying they "barely affect the speeds" is a bit harsh. If you compare some new motherboards out there you might not see much difference in performance, but if you take a new motherboard out there and a 4-year old one and compare them, you'll see a difference.

Anyway, in the end it comes down to the features, if it's old enough to only support 4x AGP instead of 8x, then we have found our problem

AND not to forget motherboard drivers! I got frusturated with BF2 because it took about 2-3 minutes to verify the client data. (Which BF2 does after loading a map before letting you play). After trying everything else I updated my motherboard drivers, and voila: it now takes about 10 seconds to verify the data.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Mon, 15 Aug 2005 06:09:02 GMT

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

I was basing the motherboard thing on what he has now. If he got a brand new motherboard the difference wouldn't be so noticable. Again, a motherboard would NOT dramatically decrease his FPS like that. The difference between AGP 8x and PCI Express is actually unoticable really, since most games today don't really have support for it.

Also, I don't know why everyone keeps ignoring how I keep stating how I obtain better performance than him with an older video card.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Wed, 17 Aug 2005 06:37:13 GMT

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

icedog90 wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 13:53JPNOD wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 06:40Put a AMD Sempron/Axp against a AMD 64 with a GF6800 and your fps will be significant lower.

Yes, but not that dramatically.

Again, the impact on a game on that might be lighter but. With a processor running behind the gfx the full potential of the gfx will never be achieved.

Also Celeron --> Sempron almost so how can it be that fast (unless overclocked.

Then seeing Sempron same as AXp pretty much.

JPNOD wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 06:40

The only way to test this is by putting in a slower GFX card. If the fps is the same it means his other pc components are running behind the graphics card.

Quote:

If you read my last post, I stated that I have a lot slower of a video card with a pretty equivalent processor and I get better performance than him.

Maybe he doesn't run the same sort of setup? He can say 2.6 Ghz but what if it would be a Celeron?

Also not everyone has the same kinds of software/drivers on comps. If I'd compare my slow 2.6 to a 3.4ghz in Renegade I wouldn't see the difference with the eye really. Just testing one game...

JPNOD wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 06:40

And may post your other system spec's too. Saying a 4 years old mobo. If it has a slow chip the problem lies there.

My motherboard is about three years old. The motherboard is the ultimate least of his problems, since motherboards barely affect the speed of the computer.

I really doubt that. But it's not the largest factor.

Athlon XP 2600+ 2.1GHz 333MHz FSB

1024MB DDR PC2700

Gainward Geforce FX 5600 256MB

MSI D7N2 Delta-L Motherboard

Western Digital 80GB 7200RPM

Quote:Quote:

Actually I meant the system of the guy with the problems. If we see what setup he has we might be able to help him, or not

Also just curious what card did you have before the FX5600?

Subject: Re: GFX Question.
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Wed, 17 Aug 2005 06:41:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote title=Scythar wrote on Sun, 14 August 2005 18:07]

Anyway, in the end it comes down to the features, if it's old enough to only support 4x AGP instead of 8x, then we have found our problem

The Difference between AGP 4 and AGP 8x is like 1% or nothing.

It's marketing.

PCI-E is faster but again the GFX of these days now a days Don't run the bandwidth it can handle anyways.

Drivers is a good one though. Also if he has like 40 processes running in the background or, some virus or whatever it can decrease your performance dramatically not going out that he has any of those though^

Subject: Re: GFX Question.
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 17 Aug 2005 09:30:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JPNOD wrote on Wed, 17 August 2005 01:37Also just curious what card did you have before the FX5600?

nVIDA Riva TNT2 16MB...

Subject: Re: GFX Question.
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Wed, 17 Aug 2005 17:15:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OssuM!

>Geforce 2mmx400 pci.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.
Posted by [Opalkilla](#) on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 16:47:25 GMT

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

deadfive wrote on Fri, 12 August 2005 18:31 The thing is...I may have to get a whole new motherboard to get anything better than my 9200 SE. Since I only have PCI. I will have to do some searching up to do.

Tip: Go with PCI-Express instead of AGP-shit. The Radeon X300 (which I own and would highly recommend to anyone looking for a low-budget card) is a great option.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 06 Nov 2005 00:10:57 GMT

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

I just got the Geforce 6800 AGP 8x (not GT) and it runs CS:S COMPLETELY maxed out with 4x antialiasing and 16x anistropic filtering. It runs perfectly smooth. I think DJM definitely has a defected card or something, because even the 6800 is doing a million times better than his 6800 GT.

The CPU can't be the bottleneck either, because even my CPU is running it fine, which is just about as fast as his CPU.

Subject: Re: GFX Question.

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Thu, 09 Mar 2006 12:31:06 GMT

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

Here we go:

i'm on a 1996 Mhz intel processor on a six year old system with AGP 4x and a Radeon 9550 and lo and behold: my FPS can be higher than 80.... (ok, online it looks more like 35-40)

768 MB of RAM and my always.dat is in 1162 peices

i prefer ATI over Nvidea for the control panel...
