Comparison performance report

To evaluate the performance using different amounts of threads, the following settings were applied (less iterations, more points):

Resolution: 1920x1080

Number of iterations: 10.000 Number of initial points: 2.000

Number of linear transformations: 5

Pattern of non-linear transformation: Diamond

Symmetry parameter: 4

Number of threads: 1-5 (since >5 threads don't increase performance)

To compare the 1st performance, the following procedure was chosen: generate 10 similar fractals in a row with the specific settings, and find t_{avg} :

$$t_{avg} = \frac{t_{total}}{10}$$

Results:

1 thread: $t_{avg} = 17306ms$ 2 threads: $t_{avg} = 11396ms(-35\%)$ 3 threads: $t_{avg} = 10096ms(-12\%)$ 4 threads: $t_{avg} = 9536ms(-6\%)$ **5 threads:** $t_{avg} = 12756ms(+33\%)$

To evaluate the performance using different amounts of threads, the following settings were applied (more iterations, less points):

Resolution: 1920x1080

Number of iterations: 30.000 Number of initial points: 20

Number of linear transformations: 5 (since >5 threads don't increase per-

formance)

Pattern of non-linear transformation: Diamond

Symmetry parameter: 4 Number of threads: 1-5

To compare the 2nd performance, the following procedure was chosen: generate 20 similar fractals in a row with the specific settings, and find t_{avg} :

$$t_{avg} = \frac{t_{total}}{20}$$

Results:

1 thread: $t_{avg} = 868ms$

2 threads: $t_{avg} = 741ms(-15\%)$

3 threads: $t_{avg} = 668ms(-10\%)$

4 threads: $t_{avg} = 872ms(+30\%)$ 5 threads: $t_{avg} = 917ms(+5\%)$

Observation: the more points there are in a fractal, the greater the performance boost will be when running multiple threads.