

## Re: System IRQ's

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.misc/2004-08/0115.html>

---

**From:** JT ([datacare\\_at\\_zipnet.us](mailto:datacare_at_zipnet.us))

**Date:** 08/03/04

Date: Tue, 03 Aug 2004 15:12:48 -0500

On Mon, 02 Aug 2004 17:19:34 GMT, "relic" <nospam@relic211.cjb.net> wrote:

>JT wrote:

>> On Sun, 01 Aug 2004 20:33:23 GMT, "relic" <nospam@relic211.cjb.net>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> DeMoN LaG wrote:

>>>> "relic" <nospam@relic211.cjb.net> wrote in

>>>> [news:ptbPc.68611\\$SO5.47788@twister.socal.rr.com](mailto:news:ptbPc.68611$SO5.47788@twister.socal.rr.com):

>>>>

>>>>> Go ogle. It's ACPI.

>>>>>

>>>>

>>>> ACPI and APIC are two different things. Go ogle yourself.

>>>

>>> There are 4 entries. NOTHING to do with System IRQ's is mentioned

>>> in them. That would be ACPI.

>>

>>

>><http://www.microsoft.com/whdc/system/sysperf/IO-APIC.msp#XSLTsection127121120120>

>>

>> Microsofts info on APIC. Google for "APIC interupt" and you won't

>> get all the noise of non-related links

>>

>

>I probably sounded like I'm trying to argue that it's /not/ APIC, it's that I

>saw advice to the OP about using APIC. I believe the option in BIOS is ACPI,

>not APIC; at least it is on the motherboards I've seen lately. You have to

>enable ACPI to get APIC.

Depends heavily on the BIOS and what they have modified. APIC does not Have to depend on ACPI.

You came across as though APIC didn't exist, which it very much does. You also came across as though APIC didn't have anything to do with IRQs and sharing, which it very much does. You also said that there were only 4 google results and they had nothing to do with IRQs. That was just wrong.

JT