

## Re: fixed time slices?

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.kernel/2007-06/msg00192.htm>

---

- *From:* "m" <[m@xxx](mailto:m@xxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 21 Jun 2007 17:01:04 -0400
- 

AFAIR this is a hardware dependent value. The thread schedule in all NT based OSes has always behaved this way.

"Don Burn" <[burn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:burn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:%23Jeb0DEtHHA.2004@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:%23Jeb0DEtHHA.2004@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

The minimum wait interval unless you explicitly change it is 10ms plus some overhead for getting in and out of the kernel, etc. So 15ms is about what I would expect. Use the multimedia timers if you want to go below 10ms.

--

Don Burn (MVP, Windows DDK)  
Windows 2k/XP/2k3 Filesystem and Driver Consulting  
Website: <http://www.windrvr.com>  
Blog: <http://msmvps.com/blogs/WinDrvr>  
Remove StopSpam to reply

"Jan Bruns" <[testzugang\\_janbruns@xxxxxxxx](mailto:testzugang_janbruns@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:467ada27\\$0\\$6441\\$9b4e6d93@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:467ada27$0$6441$9b4e6d93@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hallo.

I've noticed that my XP computer seems to handle time-slices different from what I think it used to.

The rule I remember it should be is like defined in the SDK:

| If a higher-priority thread becomes available to run, the system  
| ceases to execute the lower-priority thread (without allowing it  
| to finish using its time slice), and assigns a full time slice  
| to the higher-priority thread.

But now, if I create a process/thread that does nothing but this:

```
repeat
for i := 0 to n do begin
```

Re: fixed time slices?

```
setWaitableTimer(timer,...);  
waitForSingleObjectEx(timer,...);  
end;  
write_time;  
until false;
```

it turns out that the minimum wait interval seems to be 15ms, and other timer-intervals are rounded up to something near a multiple of that minimum wait interval, even if I set a high priority to that process and the system is otherwise idle.

The same thing happens using sleep().

What's going on here?

Gruss

Jan Bruns