

## Re: Start menu items inncorrectly sized when changing screen DPI

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2005-02/10832.html>

---

**From:** DanS (*t.h.i.s.n.t.h.a.t\_at\_a.d.e.l.p.h.i.a.n.e.t*)

**Date:** 02/07/05

Date: Mon, 07 Feb 2005 11:49:42 -0600

alex.melhuish6388@gmail.com wrote in news:1107789321.496439.107320@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com:

> *I know this. Think about the practicalities. As you increase the resolution, the monitor becomes less able to handle higher refresh rates. The resolution of 1280x960 (which I might add *\*is\** a 4:3 resolution. 1280x1024 is *\*not\**) seemed to be the best setting for resolution to refresh ratio.*

you are absolutely correct, my mistake 1280 x 960 is 4:3

> *Also, I don't care if that's 'preferable' – it's technically wrong! I do a lot of graphic design work, using professional applications like Adobe Photoshop. Photoshop uses the DPI setting of the monitor to determine what is a *\*real\** inch (as *\*all\** applications should). So that when you choose view>print size, it really *\*is\** print size. You could literally hold up a piece of paper that size to the screen, and it would fit exactly.*

>

> *My point is there is a bug in Windows, which must be fixed. I can live with this, but it's still a problem. I find it rather aggrovating that so many people don't know how to setup their equipment properly.*

is it a bug , or is it just that you think it should be done differently ? for the average user, what is there to set up ? how many people even think that you should calibrate your scanner, to the screen, to the printer ? i would NOT say it is a bug, as you are free to measure your monitor, calculate the DPI, and then set the DPI to the result.

> *biggest horror must be the thought of application developers unaware of this fact, who blindly design their software in 96 DPI (no doubt on a > 21" monitor in 1600x1200 squinting at their tiny fonts).*

i take offense to this, somewhat, as i do not 'blindly' develop application's based on 96 dpi. i develop software with the default

microsoft.public.windowsxp.general: Re: Start menu items incorrectly sized when changing screen DPI

setting of 96 dpi, because 96 dpi is what the majority of windows installation's are set to. and by majority, in this instance, is probably 99.9%.

- >
- > *Even if this problem isn't fixed in an update, I would hope that the*
- > *Avalon team wake up to monitor DPI, and stop calling it by a stupid*
- > *name like 'screen fonts'. It has nothing to do with fonts – it's about*
- > *physical resolution (not virtual pixel resolution). A simple routine*
- > *when installing Windows is all that's required:*
- > *Request the type of monitor and it's dimensions (i.e. CRT or LCD, 17"*
- > *or 21") then use the optimum resolution based on this data (i.e. LCD is*
- > *\*always\* run at full resolution, for 17" this is normally 1280x1024).*
- > *Then, ask the user to place a ruler on the screen, and drag the slider*
- > *until the physical ruler matches the virtual ruler on screen. Done –*
- > *now 12pt on screen is 12 pt on paper. 3 centimetres on screen is 3*
- > *centimetres on paper. When you select 100% in word, and hold up a piece*
- > *of paper to the screen, it's exactly the same size. Wouldn't that be a*
- > *lovely world? Would it really be \*that\* hard?*

i would think it's much more complex than that, on a regular CRT monitor anyway. you would have to give exact height and width measurement's of what the monitor is able to display, after you pick the refresh rate, re-calibration would then be necessary for any simple geometry adjustment made on the monitor.

- > *This would all be so much simpler in Avalon, as it's vector based*
- > *(rather than the pixels of Windows XP and previous) so scaling is very*
- > *simple.*
- >
- > *Wake up Microsoft – people do want this, and you should've realised*
- > *this long ago. Find me a monitor that uses 96 DPI nowadays!*
- >
- >

so if you are a professional graphic artist, why do you not use a Mac, as we all know that there's 'no' 'bugs' or issues of any kind with Mac's.