

Re: Slow Start-up

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2006-11/msg00726.html>

- *From:* Jacques <Jacques@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 2 Nov 2006 11:11:02 -0800
-

Thanks for the good info.

I'm thinking of buying now a new laptop because I'm losing time now. I went to Best Buy and I found one at

<http://www.bestbuy.com/site/olspage.jsp?skuId=8032489&type=product&productCategoryId=pcmcat103700050047&>

It's not the Intel processor but it's AMD 64 X2 1.6 Ghz, for \$900. It's still better than a 2.4 GHz pentium 4, right?

About Windows Vista, Best Buy will provide free upgrade by mail when it comes out, so that's another good reason for me to buy.

Do you know when Windows Vista will come out?

Or maybe I should wait that laptop with Office 2007 comes out? do you know when Office 2007 comes out?

Jacques

"Bob I" wrote:

basically you get 2 processors in one package. There are a couple of things that result in it not being twice as fast. One, there is overhead that causes a little processor use because they have to share resources and two, the work has to be assigned or parceled out. In general use, you would see anything from about 120 to 180% of a single processor of the given speed. As for the hard drive, lets say you replace the 4200 with a 7200 rpm. You won't be changing the burst speed(read from cache) but you may pick up the hardware data transfer rate maybe 50-60 percent. So outlook takes 2 seconds to load instead of 3. My personal choice would be to continue using the current laptop as is for about a year and then in middle of next year when the Vista installs are all sorted out by the vendors, pick up a new one with all the bells and whistles.

Jacques wrote:

Mistake: I bought my laptop \$1800 3 years and half, not 2 years and half.
So let say, a 1.6GHz Intel® Centrino® Duo processor is faster than a 2.4 GHz Pentium 4?
Is a 1.6 Ghz Centrino Duo roughly equivalent to a 3.2 GHz (1.6 times 2)

Re: Slow Start-up

pentium 4?
Thanks for all your good advices.

"Bob I" wrote:

You may do as you wish, but I believe you are placing WAY TOO MUCH emphasis on the "speed" of the laptop. As to 2 Ghz well CPU's have 2 cores or processors instead of one now. You may wish to review those laptops with that in mind.

Jacques wrote:

I have 2 choices: either I spend \$187 on a new hard drive (with 80GB instead of 60GB) and a Hard Drive Upgrade Kit USB 2.0. It clones the old hard drive into the new one so I don't loose time resintalling all OS and softwares.

Either I resell my laptop for \$400 on ebay and buy a new one. I bought it \$1800 2 and half years ago. But I don't understand, I went to bestbuy.com and I couldn't find one with the same processor speed as mine: 2.4 GHz (Pentium 4). The maximum speed was 2 GHz. So because of that, I'm not interested in buying a new laptop (even if I will have free upgrade to Windows Vista). Do you know why, 2 years and half later, processor speeds have not increased in store?

Also, if I buy a new laptop, I would have to loose time resintalling many old programs.

"Bob I" wrote:

Re: Slow Start-up

Think I would save my money up and buy a better laptop, and not get too worried about the current one. You may want to consider using the hibernate feature.

Jacques wrote:

I found a possibility to upgrade my hard drive at

<http://www.drivesolutions.com/cgi-bin/shop/ug2store.cgi?command=>

It would cost me \$130, it's cheaper than buying a new laptop.

But I would lose much time in reinstalling all the programs.

So you advise me to replace the hard drive? it would solve my problem of

slow startup?

The other problems I had were:

Outlook takes much time to start up, when I click on Internet

Re: Slow Start-up

explorer
program, it
takes 3
seconds to
open.

Jacques

"Bob I"
wrote:

4200
rpm
is
excruciatingly
slow.
I
would
venture
that
that
is
a
big
part
of
the
"slow".
While
it
would
help
with
battery
life,
you
will
pay
the
price
in
time
whenever
you
need
to
wait

Re: Slow Start-up

while
something
has
to
be
retrieved
from
disc,
like
bootup
for
instance.

Jacques
wrote:

AC
plugged
in.
No
HP
utility
is
running.
It's
a
4200
RPM.

"Bob
I"
wrote:

Is
that
speed
with
the
AC
plugged
in
or

Re: Slow Start-up

is
it
running
on
battery?
How
much
"HP"
utilities
are
being
loaded?
Is
it
a
5400
rpm
drive
or
7200
rpm.
Oh
so
many
possibilities!

Jacques
wrote:

Very
good
question.
I
have
a
Compaq
Presario
laptop
2.4
GHz
and
512
MB
RAM.

"Leftred"

Re: Slow Start-up

Re: Slow Start-up

wrote:

"Jacques"
<Jacques@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:AE76BABB-2769-45>

I
posted
a
question
a
few
weeks
ago
about
my
laptop
taking
6
minutes
to
start
up.
A
few
people
told
me
that
it
should
be
1
minute
instead.
When
I

Re: Slow Start-up

Re: Slow Start-up

time
the
start-up,
I
don't
stop
the
time
when
I
see
the
desktop
(which
is
pretty
quick)
but
when
the
hard
drive
light
stop
to
be
always
on
(meaning
that
startup
programs
have
finished
to
load).
So
for
people
who
have
a
start-up
time
of
1
minute,
did
you
time
it

Re: Slow Start-up

Re: Slow Start-up

like
I
did?

Then
I
followed
the
advices
given
on
my
post,
I
removed
the
maximum
of
startup
items
(items
that
I
don't
use
every
day)
in
msconfig
and
the
start-up
time
became
5
minutes.
It
was
not
good
enough
so
I
decided
to
uninstall
ZoneAlarm
(Firewall
Protection)
and
use

Re: Slow Start-up

Re: Slow Start-up

Windows
Firewall
instead.
The
start-up
time
is
now
3
minutes
45
seconds
(measured
with
the
hard
drive
light
turned
off
like
described
above).
Is
it
good
enough
now?

You
don't
mention
the
specs
of
your
laptop.
If
you
have
a
slow
CPU
and
not
much
RAM
you
should
expect

Re: Slow Start-up

Re: Slow Start-up

a
slow
boot
time.
What
have
you
got?