Continue

DLSS Resolution 1440p Docked 1080p Handheld... should be around the same rednderin resolutions or around the same I think there was an important distinction as there was some doubt cast earlier in the thread as to whether DLSS would be able to help games reach a higher res than what PS4 could produce natively. Hogwarts Legacy is up to 1440p Docked Mode and 1080p Portable mode. Both using DLSS. So DF basically pixel-counted the input resolution rather than the output resolution. Up to 1440 doesn't make sense if they are using DLSS, because with DLSS the output resolution stays the same and you change the input resolution. So unless they're talking about resolution in menus or cutscenes, I'd wait for more gameplay footage before coming to a conclusion. I think there was an important distinction as there was some doubt cast earlier in the thread as to whether DLSS would be able to help games reach a higher res than what PS4 could produce natively. It just depends how much overhead they leave to run the dlss calculation wich costs some ms rendering time... I guess the higher the demand of the game the lower the internal and external resolutions... But yes there will be a lot of games being uped to 1440p with dlss. Especialy once devs get into grips how they scale handheld and then docked modes. We should wait and see if it's the old-gen /Switch 1 version updated or the next gen Article has some new screens in it and it is pretty clearly the Switch 2 version as opposed to the Switch 1 version. The article also mentions all the improvements from the Switch 1 version and how there is no loading screens in the open world now. This is the updated version for sure. Last edited: May 8, 2025 We should wait and see if it's the old-gen /Switch 1 version updated or the next gen Are you talking about Hogwarts? We're talking about Civ FYI! Hogwarts we know from the Creator's Voice is a brand new port they made, it's not an up-port of the Switch 1 Sidebar, even in that video I thought it looked kinda shit - low res, obvious artifacting on hair, etc. Good reminder here that you never know how old a build is or how significantly things can improve before release! Article has some new screens in it and it is pretty clearly the Switch 2 version as opposed to the Switch 1 version. The article also mentions all the improvements from the Switch 1 version and how there is no loading screens in the open world now. This is the updated version for sure. Link to the article? At this point the main point of conflict I have with equating a Switch 2 to a PS4 level experience, is I'd already equate a Switch 1 to that, as that device gave very many PS4-level experiences IMO. So I don't think I'd equate the Switch 1 and the Switch 2 to the same level of hardware. DLSS Resolution 1440p Docked 1080p Handheld... should be around the same rednderin resolutions or around the same Should mean native 540p handheld, native 720p docked and they are using the headroom for DLSS instead of trying to increase native resolution up to PS4 levels. Is the Switch version of Hogwarts the same as the other versions or is it like Switch it's own version and this cannot be compared the same as the other versions? Yeah, DF defiantly done bad job with its early analyzes, they were wrong about resolutions, they were wrong about point that games done use DLSS, they were wrong about MKW dont using any AA...and based on that they made conclusions, closer we are to launch seems that Switch 2 games running at higher resolution than they reported. Digital Foundry were just a little conservative about setting expectations... But i think in the comming weeks they will be pleasantly suprised by switch 2s capabilitys. But the Switch 2 is not in the Ballpark of a Series S but can make good on that through a lot better image quality even in 1080p games which use DLSS. I for myself see the Switch 2 in the Ballpark of a PS4 Pro when docked and standard PS4 in Handheld. This power should let it play almost all tripple A games atleast until next gen is upon us. Although only in 540p with DLSS. But then i think it will be the same situation as with Switch 1 all over again as soon as PS6 drops. You will start seing a lot of next gen games which struggle on Switch 2 by then. Switch 2 would have been the perfect Nintendo Konsole in the Timeframe 2020-2028. But for First Party Nintendo Titles the Switch 2 should be more than enough and i even doubt that Nintendo has the Developer ressources to max out that Hardware. Last edited: May 8, 2025 Yeah, DF defiantly done bad job with its early analyzes, they were wrong about resolutions, they were wrong about point that games done use DLSS, they were wrong about MKW dont using any AA...and based on that they made conclusions, closer we are to launch seems that Switch 2 games running at higher resolution than they reported. I don't think they were wrong about Hogwarts' resolution for example, that's just what it was at the time Is the Switch version of Hogwarts the same as the other versions or is it like Switch it's own version and this cannot be compared the same as the other versions? It's the same as the others now. Digital Foundry already reported a cleaner/better image compared to the PS4, albeit running at 720p internal resolution.... they just couldn't figure why. The switch 2 's use of DLSS seems pretty unique and effective. Hogwarts on PS4/Xbox One is not a very good experience btw...and not because of the graphics. Graphics look fine on those systems and are not the problem. It's the loading times and asset pop-in, that makes this a much worse experience. I'm very interested how this turns out on the switch 2 because it'll tell us a lot about the system's capabilities. The biggest bottleneck for this game on the last-gen systems was CPU performance, ram and storage speed....the switch 2 has an advantage here and I expect it to show in the end product. I don't think they were wrong about Hogwarts' resolution for example, that's just what it was at the time Thing is, their whole analyzes were like Switch 2 was already released and those games were also released, and based on that they made conclusions including this thread naming, they didnt treat them like things in development that yet needs to be released. Talking about Hogwart specify, they couldn't say its using DLSS, even they said it look sharper than PS4 version despite it runs at lower resolution than PS4 version. Talking about Hogwart specify, they couldn't say its using DLSS, even they said it look sharper than PS4 version despite it runs at lower resolution than PS4 version. That's because it could be any other upscaler than DLSS (especially when even first party games like MP4 appear to use FSR and not DLSS, and so far the DLSS implementation on switch seems different/better than what they're used to on PC), or even something else like different settings. Thing is, their whole analyzes were like Switch 2 was already released and those games were also released, and based on that they made conclusions including this thread naming, they didnt treat them like things in development that yet needs to be released. They did treat it like non-final products, that is why they actually address these subjects in their podcast, and not in dedicated Switch 2 tech analysis videos, and have been very careful to specify that their numbers are mostly based on inextensive and sub-quality material. I wouldn't completely dismiss DF's analysis because of a PR statement that isn't supported by any game direct footage or screenshots. Yakuza 0 was also supposed to run at 4K60 according to a PR statement. That's because it could be any other upscaler than DLSS (especially when even first party games like MP4 appear to use FSR and not DLSS, and so far the DLSS implementation on switch seems different/better than what they're used to on PC), or even something else like different settings. They did treat it like non-final products, that is why they actually address these subjects in their podcast, and not in dedicated Switch 2 tech analysis videos, and have been very careful to specify that their numbers are mostly based on inextensive and sub-quality material. Point is that they couldnt tell and they were wrong about some other things, and people take their analyzes like fact. Disagree, all their are analyzes were sounding like they are final products, their conclusions even more so, even this quote from this thread: "So overall, I think the Switch 2 is doing a pretty great job of turning in PS4 level visuals. Again, possibly, with other upgrades and loading times...other upgrades when it comes to more modern titles that are pushing out more advanced rendering technologies...I think that's probably what you can expect is a PS4 level experience". I wouldn't completely dismiss DF's analysis because of a PR statement that isn't supported by any game direct footage or screenshots. Yakuza 0 was also supposed to run at 4K60 according to a PR statement. When comes to Yakuza 0, its best to wait actually launch of game, there is no sense to release PR statement about 4K if game doesnt at least target 4K for launch. I thought Hogwarts is 720p? Looked much better and sharper than the PS4 version. At this point the main point of conflict I have with equating a Switch 2 to a PS4 level experience, is I'd already equate a Switch 1 to that, as that device gave very many PS4-level experiences IMO. So I don't think I'd equate the Switch 1 and the Switch 2 to the same level of hardware. There is nothing on Switch that comes close to stuff like RDR2 or TLOU2, improved versions of those would be possible on Switch 2, but they would run like garbage on Switch 1. 8NM is expected but disappointing. I might wait for a refresh for better battery life. Yeah, DF defiantly done bad job with its early analyzes, they were wrong about resolutions, they were wrong about point that games done use DLSS, they were wrong about MKW dont using any AA...and based on that they made conclusions, closer we are to launch seems that Switch 2 games running at higher resolution than they reported. I just think that it would be right of digital foundry to give a statement in their df direct about why their Switch 2 analysis was lacking or why they were off by quite some margins... i mean they sureley have their reasons. i bet that telling this new method of dlss is somehow realy challenging. And it must be somewhat hard to pixelcount switch 2 games or at least the conditions make it hard (offscreen and so on). Never the less it would be realy nice of Digital Foundry to comment on what is making it hard for them. And to maybe correct the course about estimated power of switch 2 when docked performance is looking more of ps4 pro performance level and Handheld alone achieves Standard Ps4 levels. Its just nice to hear look guys in this case we were underestimating what we were seing and to course correct the information just a little. They made a good start in the last direct but didnt follow all the way through with it. Last edited: May 8, 2025 Settings aren't different you still have ultra performance, performance, balanced and quality and we know that from how SF6 works alone. Don't believe me go search how to turn seeing the setting on like an fps overlay in windows registry and test games yourself half of 1080p will result 540p which means it's performance. Yeah I know, but I'm a DLSS @ 1080p user, I'm used what the 1080p output resolve looks like at different presets, I also know that there is no pre-existing DLSS implementation on SF6 PC. What we have seen so far is super clean and stable (which is not often the case at 1080p, except for DLAA, and recently for quality with transformer model), and I would be the first to be mistaken about the presence of DLSS in the switch footage seen so far, so I wouldn't rush to blame DF for not guessing there is DLSS. Yeah I know, but I'm a DLSS @ 1080p user, I'm used what the 1080p output resolve looks like at different presets, I also know that there is no pre-existing DLSS implementation on SF6 PC. What we have seen so far is super clean and stable (which is not often the case at 1080p, except for DLAA, and recently for quality with transformer model), and I would be the first to be mistaken about the presence of DLSS in the switch footage seen so far, so I wouldn't rush to blame DF for not guessing there is DLSS. Surely all Transformer Model upcales to 1080p should be looked at. Especialy Performance Mode with the Transformer Model. Also Digital Foundry needs to get familiar with 1080p DLSS upscales especialy from lower bound resolutions. Maybe that was what was causing problems for them because they were not used to theese upscales from theese low resolutions? Yeah I know, but I'm a DLSS @ 1080p user, I'm used what the 1080p output resolve looks like at different presets, I also know that there is no pre-existing DLSS implementation on SF6 PC. What we have seen so far is super clean and stable (which is not often the case at 1080p, except for DLAA, and recently for quality with transformer model), and I would be the first to be mistaken about the presence of DLSS in the switch footage seen so far, so I wouldn't rush to blame DF for not guessing there is DLSS. I love switching between CNN and transformer they have their benefits especially if you're in to racing games with it. Most of the tech sans FSR gets thumbs up from me when I need or want it's usage. Where do I blame DF in that post? Nor am I considering they corrected their interpretation of SF6 or in general when a statement is off. I hope we see more games targeting 60fps on Switch 2. Or 40fps for resolutions over 1080p or more demanding games. And I think because of Steam Deck bringing 40fps as a legit standard (and current gen games more often than not targeting 60fps) there's a pretty good it will happen. so after watching everything, my conclusion is that is quite better than a PS4 but not as good as the Series S, but it has DLSS so it makes up for it, getting closer to this generation than the last one. This is not from a place of authority, I have none. It's from a place of decorum. Don't do this. I'm sure that if they care they're aware of the thread. I'm sure if they're uninterested in the thread, your pinging them isn't going to make them any more interested. Page 2 This is not from a place of authority, I have none. It's from a place of decorum. Don't do this. I'm sure that if they care they're aware of the thread. I'm sure if they're uninterested in the thread, your pinging them isn't going to make them any more interested. Ok... i edited it out, didnt mean no harm. Maybe you take it out of the quote as well then? so after watching everything, my conclusion is that is quite better than a PS4 but not as good as the Series S, but it has DLSS so it makes up for it, getting closer to this generation than the last one. It only makes up for it with dlss if the games had higher res on the big konsoles.... if the game was already running 540p with FSR then it wont quite get there performance wise. But otherwise yup thats prety much what we are looking at. Somewhere between PS4 and Series S ;-) Last edited: May 8, 2025 Yeah, DF defiantly done bad job with its early analyzes, they were wrong about resolutions, they were wrong about point that games done use DLSS, they were wrong about MKW dont using any AA...and based on that they made conclusions, closer we are to launch seems that Switch 2 games running at higher resolution than they reported. They were doing educated speculation based on footage during a podcast. It was not a game analysis. These early speculations are not meant as gospel. People took it personally because they didn't feel it was positive enough, and when the truth occasionally showed a more positive light, some saw that as a worthy time to hammer DF about about being wrong, or even worse, deceitful. I think this whole situation has been really pathetic, to be honest. DF does a lot of this early impressions stuff on the podcast, and people at large didn't take it so seriously until so many took the Switch 2 coverage personally. It's truly not a big deal at all. They had their speculation, impressions, etc. and then when the games release they'll do their proper analysis. They were doing educated speculation based on footage during a podcast. It was not a game analysis. These early speculations are not meant as gospel. People took it personally because they didn't feel it was positive enough, and when the truth occasionally showed a more positive light, some saw that as a worthy time to hammer DF about about being wrong, or even worse, deceitful. I think this whole situation has been really pathetic, to be honest. DF does a lot of this early impressions stuff on the podcast, and people at large didn't take it so seriously until so many took the Switch 2 coverage personally. It's truly not a big deal at all. They had their speculation, impressions, etc. and then when the games release they'll do their proper analysis. It was always a given that df did analysis on things coming from Directs, State of Plays and Reveal Events... How come all of a sudden this type of content gets down played to a point of they will do their judgements when the games come out? There is a great big part of their users, fanbase and community which rely on the pre evaluations they put out even in their directs. I dont agree with your point of view at all. Some people make purchasing decisions of of this sort of information. Even if its early information. It was always a given that df did analysis on things coming from Directs, State of Plays and reveals... How come all of a sudden this type of content gets down played to they will do their judgements when the games come out? There is a great big part of their user and fanbase which realy on the pre evaluations they put out even in their directs. I dont agree with your point of view. I'm not saying it's not worthy of listening to. I have loved listening to their impressions. I'm just saying it doesn't need SCRUTINY, as it's not a proper analysis and not sold as such. We're only talking more about how it's not a proper analysis BECAUSE so many in the Nintendo community are taking their impressions so personally. If they hadn't, nodoby would be trying to "downplay" it, because it would be just like any of their other impressions/reactions and not taken as gospel. I'm not saying it's not worthy of listening to. I have loved listening to their impressions. I'm just saying it doesn't need SCRUTINY, as it's not a proper analysis and not sold as such. We're only talking more about how it's not a proper analysis BECAUSE so many in the Nintendo community are taking their impressions so personally. If they hadn't, nodoby would be trying to "downplay" it, because it would be just like any of their other impressions/reactions and not taken as gospel. I also dont think its worth the scrutiny... and i think one should stay very polite with the DF Team. I am very thankful for their work. I just think in this case somehing went sub optimal in their work flow. Or maybe they did not give it the priority it was needed. I do understand that work scedules can be overwhelming. Making the right decisions all the time in theese type of things is impossible. Sometimes its just a blink of an eye and the community devours you. But the correcting of the data to the community did also not go very good, or to atleast explain what went wrong in their planning of analysis. I understand all sides here but the situation did not go to well.. Maybe they will adress it all in the end. I will never understand why this statement was so controversial. The Switch 2 being a PS4-like console should've been everyone's expectation. It's the follow-up to the Switch, which was a PS3/X360-like console. Yes, it will probably be superior to the PS4 in many ways, much like the Switch 1 was. But it will be running at resolutions and framerates lower than the PS5/XSX, much like the Switch was. The Doom 2016/Eternal and Witcher 3 ports to Switch could only run on much lower settings, and I would expect the same from the Switch 2. DLSS will be a nice boost, undoubtedly. Switch 2 may end up being the best console of the PS4/XOne generation, but it is still of that "generation" of hardware. Digital Foundry don't have any reason to be biased. They all love Nintendo (except Alex maybe, but he doesn't like any consoles) and they do great work, it's a shame to see this type of reaction. There is nothing on Switch that comes close to stuff like RDR2 or TLOU2, improved versions of those would be possible on Switch 2, but they would run like garbage on Switch 1. As an "experience" wouldn't TW3 come close to RDR2 (or RDR1 at the least)? I dunno, I feel like the gaming experiences you get on a PS4 and a Switch 1 are very much similar overall, sure not every single game is possible on a Switch 1, but if similar games are available and the majority of third party games are also available, even if they run worse, to most it's still the same experience, even if it is a bit worse overall. I feel like that's why the PS5 got so much slack - it was seen as a long time as just a PS4 Pro Pro, because almost all the games overlapped or were PS4-type experiences. Then again, what is a PS5 experience and what is a PS4 experience is a bit subjective, when the main difference is really just the faster load times, and 60fps being more common on the PS5. I will never understand why this statement was so controversial. The Switch 2 being a PS4-like console should've been everyone's expectation. It's the follow-up to the Switch, which was a PS3/X360-like console. Yes, it will probably be superior to the PS4 in many ways, much like the Switch 1 was. But it will be running at resolutions and framerates lower than the PS5/XSX, much like the Switch was. The Doom 2016/Eternal and Witcher 3 ports to Switch could only run on much lower settings, and I would expect the same from the Switch 2. DLSS will be a nice boost, undoubtedly. Switch 2 may end up being the best console of the PS4/XOne generation, but it is still of that "generation" of hardware. Digital Foundry don't have any reason to be biased. They all love Nintendo (except Alex maybe, but he doesn't like any consoles) and they do great work, it's a shame to see this type of reaction. Their is no denying what class the Hardware is in but you do have to understand that when dealing with theese mobile plattforms 1 teraflop can be a lot. Like realy a lot. A quarter of the performance. You are comparing systems here in this class which range from 1,3 to maybe 4 terraflops. Its not like comparing a 10 teraflops to a 12 teraflop machine, where it dosnt even matter if its 1 teraflop more or less such as with series x and ps5. Here in this micro cosmos it does realy still make a big difference technically and price wise if the console is a Ps4 or more in the range of a Series S or somewhere in between. It may not make that much of a difference from what happens on screen. But it does make a difference if your on the cutting edge of mobile console gaming technology. It could make a difference of several hundred dollars costwise. Try to see the argument from this type of stand point. Especialy when 80% of the discussions happening online to that time are if the hardware is worth the asking price. When dealing with handhelds you have to think in a micro cosmos. Its not your normal size dimensions where you can just jam 10 Terraflops in a somewhat big Box. Last edited: May 8, 2025 Their is no denying what class the Hardware is in but you do have to understand that when dealing with theese mobile plattforms 1 teraflop can be a lot. Like realy a lot. A quarter of the performance. You are comparing systems here in this class which range from 1,3 to maybe 4 terraflops. Its not like comparing 3 teraflops to 10 teraflops where it dosnt even matter if its 1 teraflop more or less such as with series x and ps5. Here it does realy make a difference technicly and price wise if the console is a ps4 or mor in the range of a series s or somewhere in between. It may not make that much of a difference from what happens on screen. But it does make a difference if your on the cutting edge of mobile console gaming hardware. Try to see the argument from this stand point. Sure, but historically different console generations have roughly an 8x flop multiplier between them. It's partly why this generation has been underwhelming, because the flop multiplier is less than that. The Switch 2 should perform in the PS4 to PS4 Pro range I would think, which is only a 2x flop range. I think we are all on the same page with respect to that. And the price difference between the PS4 and the PS4 Pro wasn't that large... Sure, but historically different console generations have roughly an 8x flop multiplier between them. It's partly why this generation has been underwhelming, because the flop multiplier is less than that. The Switch 2 should perform in the PS4 to PS4 Pro range I would think, which is only a 2x flop range. I think we are all on the same page with respect to that. And the price difference between the PS4 and the PS4 Pro wasn't that large... The Switch 1 has 0,24 Terraflops in Handheld and 0,39 Terraflops Docked... So Docked you are dealing with a 8x multiplier and Handheld also around that. Should work out as a nice jump from switch 1. You are not coming from a PS4. Your are moving from switch 1 in handheld to a ps4 handheld. And from Switch 1 Docked to a PS4 Pro Docked Performance. We are speaking that power in the palm of your hand. That is freaking insane! The Switch 1 has 0,24 Terraflops ind Handheld and 0,39 Terraflops Docked... So Docked you are dealing with a 8x multiplier and Handheld also around that. Should work out as a nice jump from switch 1. You are not coming from a PS4. Your are moving from switch 1 in handheld to a ps4 handheld. And from Switch 1 Docked to a PS4 Pro Docked Performance. Yes yes, which works out as expected: ~2TF handheld and ~3.2TF docked. Numbers might not be exactly this but I expect the results in game to line up roughly with these expectations. I was referring to the PS5/XSX gen as underwhelming. The PS5 is only a ~5x jump over the PS4. The Series X is an ~8x jump over Xbox One admittedly, but the Xbox One wasn't very impressive. Thing is, their whole analyzes were like Switch 2 was already released and those games were also released, and based on that they made conclusions including this thread naming, they didnt treat them like things in development that yet needs to be released. I'm sorry but none of this is true, especially the bolded. Yes yes, which works out as expected: ~2TF handheld and ~3.2TF docked. Numbers might not be exactly this but I expect the results in game to line up roughly with these expectations. I was referring to the PS5/XSX gen as underwhelming. The PS5 is only a ~5x jump over the PS4. The Series X is an ~8x jump over Xbox One admittedly, but the Xbox One wasn't very impressive. Oh ok... jup... then we are on the same page. 3,2 TF Docked should check out to PS4 Pro Performance with the different architektures. To realy grasp this you have to realy think about what they are putting in a handheld. And we are not talking about a company like sony or microsoft which put out a cutting edge handheld for 4-500 dollars. Its freaking nintendo. Actualy its realy insane. Like i said i dont anticipate that nintendo can even max out that hardware the way a naughtydog or santa monica would. We will see a lot of 60 to 120 fps games from Big N. Last edited: May 8, 2025 Dunno why dig towards those who claimed that NSW 2 is providing a PS4 level graphics, but these screenshots are PS4 level of graphics and at 30fps on NSW2. Of course, IQ is sharper because higher res of course. People just dont get that no matter if dealing with 2 Terraflops or 4 Terraflops its still PS4 level of Performance when looking at it through a PS5 lense. You have to look at it through a PS4 lense to get the Picture that 4 Terraflops is quite a bit more then PS4 level. Its just that in the age of engines that eat 10 to 50 Terraflops for breakfast it doenst matter a flying Shit if its 2 or 4 terraflops. When looked at it through the view of Nintendo that come from 300 Gigaflops with Switch 1 it will be a whole nother Galaxy. It will not run you Indiana Jones and the Great Temple with Full Path Tracing at 4K 120 😊 Last edited: May 8, 2025 The Switch 1 has 0,24 Terraflops in Handheld and 0,39 Terraflops Docked... So Docked you are dealing with a 8x multiplier and Handheld also around that. Should work out as a nice jump from switch 1. You are not coming from a PS4. Your are moving from switch 1 in handheld to a ps4 handheld. And from Switch 1 Docked to a PS4 Pro Docked Performance. We are speaking that power in the palm of your hand. That is freaking insane! Tf numbers comparisons are pretty void at this point. Simply put - you're looking at the lower end of the kind of performance we've seen in pc handhelds for years at this point. It's gonna be awesome for Nintendo games but pretty underwhelming for anything available on other systems. If you only own a Switch 2 as a handheld system then that's still exciting though, but if you have any pc handhelds from the last 3 years, or you're mainly bothered about docked play, then it's highly likely you have a better place to play those cross platform games. Tf numbers comparisons are pretty void at this point. Simply put - you're looking at the lower end of the kind of performance we've seen in pc handhelds for years at this point. It's gonna be awesome for Nintendo games but pretty underwhelming for anything available on other systems. If you only own a Switch 2 as a handheld system then that's still exciting though, but if you have any pc handhelds from the last 3 years, or you're mainly bothered about docked play, then it's highly likely you have a better place to play those cross platform games. exactly and almost korrekt... It will be at the higher end of pc handhelds when it launches. Not the lower end do to DLSS. But It will be a great Nintendo Machine and will play you the one or other Tripple A third party on your Vacation. But it shouldnt replace your PS5. And when PS6 comes around we wont event be speaking. It will be a similar Situation as with Switch 1 now. But regardless of this, to this day for Nintendo this is in terms of Handhelds a state of the art Handheld Machine. Its just that 10 or 20% improvements dont cut it theese days when Game Engines Scale from eating a 3000€ GPU up from the Nutsack upwards. Now thats a lot of Switch 2 Chips. To me it seems that people want to see a Handheld with PS5 performance... what in hell are people smoking. Last edited: May 8, 2025 Nothing we have seen so far suggest that's not PS4 level lol Well, there is there is Geekerwan's chip analysis from yesterday. It uses a variation of Rich's same downclocked 2050 test, but more targeted (including mem) and based on the spec leaks. It gives us about a 2x raster advantage for Switch 2 docked over PS4, and it even comes out a little ahead undocked. As far as I recall raster was the entire basis for Oliver's defended PS4 level experience claim but as it turns out PS4 is only around half as capable in that regard. Actually, the simulated Switch 2 benchmarks almost exactly halfway between PS4 and Series S in GPU compute. exactly and almost korrekt... It will be at the higher end of pc handhelds. Not lower end. But It will be a great Nintendo Machine and will play you the one or other Tripple A third party on your Vacation. But it shouldnt replace your PS5. And when PS6 comes around we wont event be speaking. It will be a similar Situation as with Switch 1 now. But regardless of this, to this day for Nintendo this is in terms of Handhelds a state of the art Handheld Machine. Its just that 10 or 20% improvements dont cut it theese days when Game Engines Scale from eating a 3000€ GPU up from the Nutsack. Now thats a lot of Switch 2 Chips. To me it seems that people want to see a Handheld with PS5 performance... what in hell are people smoking. I think it's more like Steam Deck level in handheld-vs-handheld, and Steam Deck is the lowest-end or close to the lowest-end of the PC handheld market. Switch 2 has the interesting distinction that it's not JUST a handheld, though. You can dock it and run it at a plugged-in-only TDP. But when you're playing it that way, it's not really fair to compare it to PC handhelds, which don't have such restrictions generally. At that point you're not really comparing handheld vs handheld except as a technicality. I think it's more like Steam Deck level in handheld-vs-handheld, and Steam Deck is the lowest-end or close to the lowest-end of the PC handheld market. Switch 2 has the interesting distinction that it's not JUST a handheld, though. You can dock it and run it at a plugged-in-only TDP. But when you're playing it that way, it's not really fair to compare it to PC handhelds, which don't have such restrictions generally. Its about like steam deck but with much more advance raytracing and DLSS capabilitys. Steam Deck would have to run the games with FSR ins 340p or so. It would have not so great image quality where switch 2 would use dlss instead and give you almost native 1080p looking image with HDR. So thats the whole advancement right there, DLSS. And that advancement was the key selling feature for nvidia gpus for pc the last XX Years 😊 Just imagine the steam deck with a nvidia apu or with a RDNA 4 modern GPU. Its about like steam deck but with much more advance raytracing and DLSS capabilitys. Steam Deck would have to run the games with FSR ins 340p or so. It would have not so great image quality where switch 2 would use dlss instead and give you almost native 1080p looking image. So thats the whole advancement there. And that advancement was the key selling feature nvidia gpus for pc the last 10 Years 😊 I can't speak to how much more capable the Switch 2's RT abilities are, but on the matter of FSR on that Steam Deck, we can definitely both agree the DLSS is very much superior. However, that difference matters MUCH less in the small screens of handhelds. The deficiencies of FSR are much more noticeable on large screens, but I've used FSR a few times on my MSI Claw and it's really not too bad. Not as good as XESS (which uses ML to upscale similar to DLSS while on an intel-based device like the Claw), but still pretty solid when dealing with such a small screen. I can't speak to how much more capable the Switch 2's RT abilities are, but on the matter of FSR on that Steam Deck, we can definitely both agree the DLSS is very much superior. However, that difference matters MUCH less in the small screens of handhelds. The deficiencies of FSR are much more noticeable on large screens, but I've used FSR a few times on my MSI Claw and it's really not too bad. Not as good as XESS, but still pretty solid when dealing with such a small screen. Thats what makes the Switch 2 such a nice hybrid this time around. You will atleast most likely at a minimum have a nice sharp 1080p image on TV when using it as a Docked Console. The whole package is just realy compeling for a Handheld hybrid system. The biggest problem is that the concept of creeping on a 500$ pricepoint and utilizing the most high end that is available to nintendo is not a thing the typical nintendo consumer wants, needs and is also not used to. And those who do spend 500$ all of a sudden think they should be getting PS5 performance. Lets think about a different concept. You release the Handheld in a way so removed from the accesories that you get the Core Handheld down to 300$ And you sell it as a single unit Handheld without the Dock. Maybe only 128GB internal and so on. Then you sell a Home Konsole Kit which include the Dock, cables, Pro Controller for another 200$ Do you guys think then the outrage would have been more modest? Would it be a better concept to let people choose if the want to pay more to play on the tv? Last edited: May 8, 2025 So basically Switch 2 : PS4 = Wii : Gamecube, does it make sense this way? (I know console comparisons never make any sense) I can't speak to how much more capable the Switch 2's RT abilities are, but on the matter of FSR on that Steam Deck, we can definitely both agree the DLSS is very much superior. However, that difference matters MUCH less in the small screens of handhelds. The deficiencies of FSR are much more noticeable on large screens, but I've used FSR a few times on my MSI Claw and it's really not too bad. Not as good as XESS (which uses ML to upscale similar to DLSS while on an intel-based device like the Claw), but still pretty solid when dealing with such a small screen. I try to avoid FSR whenever I can on my GPW WM2. So basically Switch 2 : PS4 = Wii : Gamecube, does it make sense this way? (I know console comparisons never make any sense) No. The Switch 2 has a lot of features and core components the PS4 does not. The Wii was mostly Gamecube hardware with an overclock. There were some feature tweaks but nothing nearly as significant as what we are seeing here. Nothing we have seen so far suggest that's not PS4 level lol This is very disingenuous and misses everything that adds nuance to the comparisons in general. Comparing it to either device in and of itself is a futile effort. But framing it as a "PS4 level device" when it's capable of features that are blatantly missing from PS4 is just dishonest. This isn't to say it's at PS5 level, it's not, but this narrative that goes on is corny. Yeah let's compare FF7 Remake Intergrade with PS4's version. Makes a lot of sense. Thats what makes the Switch 2 such a nice hybrid this time around. You will atleast most likely at a minimum have a nice sharp 1080p image on TV when using it as a Docked Console. The whole package is just realy compeling for a Handheld hybrid system. The biggest problem is that the concept of creeping on a 500$ pricepoint and utilizing the most high end that is available to nintendo is not a thing the typical nintendo consumer wants, needs and is also not used to. And those who do spend 500$ all of a sudden think they should be getting PS5 performance. Lets think about a different concept. You release the Handheld in a way so removed from the accesories that you get the Core Handheld down to 300$ And you sell it as a single unit Handheld without the Dock. Maybe only 128GB internal and so on. Then you sell a Home Konsole Kit which include the Dock, cables, Pro Controller for another 200$ Do you guys think then the outrage would have been more modest? Would it be a better concept to let people choose if the want to pay more to play on the tv? Well, first of all, I think the "outrage" over $449 is overblown, because I think it's a fantastic value and really not that high considering the economy we're in in 2025. And I think the outrage would have been more modest had Nintendo priced games more modestly. $60-70 at the max and I don't think the general view of being overpriced would have been nearly as big a sentiment. Secondly, in terms of compromises they could make, I don't think they could have made any compromise to the functionality and form factor. It needs to be a handheld and a console in the box. The only potential compromise might have been making a weaker handheld with a lower-end screen, but I am personally SO glad they didn't do that. For me they could have shaved 30$ off and kept it at a 60 hz screen. I dont get what they want to do with 120hz in the slightest. The only thing i can think of is keep switch 1 graphics and fire them out at 120. But that would suck in my opinion. I think the 450$ Price Point makes a lot of people think they should be getting ps5 level of performance. So the price misleads them and their knowledge. But instead its just the high end mobile gaming aspect that makes it this expensive. And people just dont have a clue. For me they could have shaved 30$ off and kept it at a 60 hz screen. I dont get what they want to do with 120hz in the slightest. The only thing i can think of is keep switch 1 graphics and fire them out at 120. But that would suck in my opinion. I think the 450$ Price Point makes a lot of people think they should be getting ps5 level of performance. So the price misleads them and their knowledge. But instead its just the high end mobile gaming aspect that makes it this expensive. And people just dont have a clue. Switch 1 debutted at the same price as the PS4 Slim at the time. Switch 2's launch price is slotted in between PS5 Digital and PS5 Slim as of now. For sure there would be some misguided expectation re. horsepower, but I doubt it will be more severe or widespread than it was with Switch 1. Well, first of all, I think the "outrage" over $449 is overblown, because I think it's a fantastic value and really not that high considering the economy we're in in 2025. And I think the outrage would have been more modest had Nintendo priced games more modestly. $60-70 at the max and I don't think the general view of being overpriced would have been nearly as big a sentiment. Secondly, in terms of compromises they could make, I don't think they could have made any compromise to the functionality and form factor. It needs to be a handheld and a console in the box. The only potential compromise might have been making a weaker handheld with a lower-end screen, but I am personally SO glad they didn't do that. Nintendo made some weird decisions with the pricing. I think it's fair to say $399.99 for the console with MK priced at a "normal" $70 was basically the best case scenario possible. Together that would have come out to $470, so Nintendo only went over the best possible price by thirty bucks, and yet they did it in such a way that it made people outraged over how "expensive" everything was. And yeah, for the sake of the Switch 2's longevity it's definitely good that they skewed more toward the high end of what's possible in a handheld form factor rather than being overly budget conscious. I've already heard from a couple more casual gamers that they don't really see the point of the Switch 2, they think the Switch 1 is still just fine, and that sentiment would have been more common if the CPU/GPU/screen and so on weren't such a big leap over the OG Switch. For me they could have shaved 30$ off and kept it at a 60 hz screen. I dont get what they want to do with 120hz in the slightest. The only thing i can think of is keep switch 1 graphics and fire them out at 120. But that would suck in my opinion. I think the 450$ Price Point makes a lot of people think they should be getting ps5 level of performance. So the price misleads them and their knowledge. But instead its just the high end mobile gaming aspect that makes it this expensive. And people just dont have a clue. I'm a big proponent of 120hz. I love when any lower-end game will let me select 120hz on my MSI Claw. The smoothness and responsiveness is so nice, even on 2D games. And I don't think anybody should/would expect PS5-levels of performance. Everyone knows that it's a handheld. Expectations are different. See now the conversation is getting intressting. So maybe... yes the pricepoint is misleading to a lot of people who think they should be getting ps5 performance for that price. And then arguments start all over the internet where some of the people who are trying to justify the price point are starting to try to quensch the switch 2 for its last performance drops so that they get closer to that performance metric that they think is fitting for the price point they have to pay. Its all so complex that you would have to have a doctor in psycology to realy understand what the hell is going on here. Some wanting to axe there ps5 and use the switch 2 as their main console cause damn... shit is expensive... and all sorts of stuff... Take it with some fun its getting late where i live 😊 Last edited: May 8, 2025 This is very disingenuous and misses everything that adds nuance to the comparisons in general. Comparing it to either device in and of itself is a futile effort. But framing it as a "PS4 level device" when it's capable of features that are blatantly missing from PS4 is just dishonest. This isn't to say it's at PS5 level, it's not, but this narrative that goes on is corny. Yeah let's compare FF7 Remake Intergrade with PS4's version. Makes a lot of sense. It's not disingenuous or dishonest. No one is arguing about the modern feature of the device or that is bad but the console will provide PS4 level visual which is great since is a portable console. A lot of people including myself have said in this unnecessary long thread that the SW2 will have PS4 level visual at similar or better image quality and performance. DLSS, a vastly better CPU and storage will be key to port some of the current gen games but it's still around a PS4, PS4 Pro even and every game we have seen so far confirm that. FF7 Remake Integrate doesn't exist on PS4 and even so I would expect a PS4 version of that to look pretty similar to the SW2 minus image quality if it uses DLSS. Late night edit: Added Deathstar made of Gamecubes in a Post above :-) Imagine whats next... will GTA 6 run on Switch 2... because i already sold my PS5. Lord help me. It's not disingenuous or dishonest. No one is arguing about the modern feature of the device or that is bad but the console will provide PS4 level visual which is great since is a portable console. A lot of people including myself have said in this unnecessary long thread that the SW2 will have PS4 level visual at similar or better image quality and performance. DLSS, a vastly better CPU and storage will be key to port some of the current gen games but it's still around a PS4, PS4 Pro even and every game we have seen so far confirm that. FF7 Remake Integrate doesn't exist on PS4 and even so I would expect a PS4 version of that to look pretty similar to the SW2 minus image quality if it uses DLSS. The Switch 2 will absolutely outclass the PS4 based on its feature set. The software being shown already proves that. You can make direct comparisons between these games and the Switch 2 is better both IQ and performance. To try to eliminate or dismiss that is disengenuine and misleading. Saying those improvements are invalid is like saying a PS4 and a PS4 Pro are the same or PS5 is the same as a PS5 Pro when clearly there are improvements in both IQ and performance. You have to admit, we will see games running on Switch 2 that could not happen without significant compromises to both IQ and performance. In fact, we're already seeing that in games like CP2077. Additionally, these are launch titles and were already seeing the Switch 2 push ahead of PS4. Things will only get better whereas the PS4 has been maxed. They were doing educated speculation based on footage during a podcast. It was not a game analysis. These early speculations are not meant as gospel. People took it personally because they didn't feel it was positive enough, and when the truth occasionally showed a more positive light, some saw that as a worthy time to hammer DF about about being wrong, or even worse, deceitful. I think this whole situation has been really pathetic, to be honest. DF does a lot of this early impressions stuff on the podcast, and people at large didn't take it so seriously until so many took the Switch 2 coverage personally. It's truly not a big deal at all. They had their speculation, impressions, etc. and then when the games release they'll do their proper analysis. Yes, they educated speculation based on footage, but they used for comparison not only offscreen videos of unfinished games but also basically 1st games on new platform, and compared that with already released PS4 games, and based on that some conclusions of Switch 2 capabilities (like saying: PS4 is a very natural point of comparison for the Switch 2; "...you can expect a PS4 level experience") and in same time ignoring Switch 2 specs that clearly showing that Switch 2 is a way more stronger/capable in almost every way than PS4. Its one thing when you doing early impressions on unreleased games for platform thats already on market and for which one we already know how strong/capable is, but very different when you doing same thing and taking conclusions for platform that yets needs to be released, because when you say "you can expect a PS4 level experience", and fact is that we have already seeing above PS4 level experience and specs alone saying that, you giving misinformation to people that yets need to decide will they buy new console or not. I'm sorry but none of this is true, especially the bolded. Strongly disagree, see my post above. This thread still going strong huh? I think the 450$ Price Point makes a lot of people think they should be getting ps5 level of performance. So the price misleads them and their knowledge. But instead its just the high end mobile gaming aspect that makes it this expensive. And people just dont have a clue. See now the conversation is getting intressting. So maybe... yes the pricepoint is misleading to a lot of people who think they should be getting ps5 performance for that price. And then arguments start all over the internet where some of the people who are trying to justify the price point are starting to try to quensch the switch 2 for its last performance drops so that they get closer to that performance metric that they think is fitting for the price point they have to pay. Its all so complex that you would have to have a doctor in psycology to realy understand what the hell is going on here. Some wanting to axe there ps5 and use the switch 2 as their main console cause damn... shit is expensive... and all sorts of stuff... Take it with some fun its getting late where i live 😊 Switch launched at same price point than PS4, and from moment its launched start selling better than PS4 in that time. People know that Switch 2 value is not only in hardware specs and power, biggest vaulue is in hybrid concept (you cant use PS5 in handheld mode or even play MKW in two players out of box with one set of Joy Cons), but also with Nintendo IP, its only next gen console where you can play Nintendo games. People who are interested in Nintendo Switch very well known they will not get PS5 power, but they can get better power than PS4. :) Last edited: May 9, 2025 See now the conversation is getting intressting. So maybe... yes the pricepoint is misleading to a lot of people who think they should be getting ps5 performance for that price. And then arguments start all over the internet where some of the people who are trying to justify the price point are starting to try to quensch the switch 2 for its last performance drops so that they get closer to that performance metric that they think is fitting for the price point they have to pay. Its all so complex that you would have to have a doctor in psycology to realy understand what the hell is going on here. Some wanting to axe there ps5 and use the switch 2 as their main console cause damn... shit is expensive... and all sorts of stuff... Take it with some fun its getting late where i live 😊 The price point of the console for most people is super reasonable regardless of how close to the PS5 the performance is. With the PS5 you re buying just hardware with Switch 2 you are buying a hybrid and a screen and all that comes with that The price point of the console for most people is super reasonable regardless of how close to the PS5 the performance is. With the PS5 you re buying just hardware with Switch 2 you are buying a hybrid and a screen and all that comes with that Well then i would be glad if it is not the problem that people seem to await more from the system because of the price poínt. I too can judge the value as a very nice hybrid system. I just wasnt sure if everybody is looking at this from the right way. GameCube 0,011 TFLOPS Switch 2 3,1 TFLOPS Switch 2 = 281,81 GameCubes ductaped together I was going from around 4 Teraflops with the 400 Cubes... But either way.... it could be way more than this since the architectures are so many years apart. So basically Switch 2 : PS4 = Wii : Gamecube, does it make sense this way? (I know console comparisons never make any sense) nope, the gap between ps4 and s2 is waaay bigger than gc to wii. the wii was literally a 50% overlocked CPU/GPU of the GC, with double the RAM (albeit, significantly improved RAM, going from the super slow 16 MB of A-RAM which was mostly used for audio and the disc buffer, to 64 MB of general purpose GDDR3 RAM, the same kind that was in the ps3/360). and there were zero featureset improvements. the vertex/pixel shaders, etc. were all identical between the two systems. put it this way, there were things the original xbox could do that the wii still couldn't (like using stencil shadows and normal mapping without blowing up, and being capable of 720p output). whereas with the S2, its GPU has roughly double the raw processing power, triple the CPU, and double the RAM (though significantly less bandwidth) of the ps4. that's not including efificiency improvements in architecture, and a more advanced featureset that includes dlss, RT, and mesh shaders to name a few. ps4 to s2 is far more of a leap than gc to wii ever was GameCube 0,011 TFLOPS Switch 2 3,1 TFLOPS Switch 2 = 281,81 GameCubes ductaped together actually, it's more like GameCube 0,009.4 TFLOPS so the official count is ~330 GCs duct taped together Last edited: May 9, 2025 If you're talking raster, GC: Vita would actually be a bit closer to PS4: NS2. My god the lengths some of you go to complain about a 1st impressions DF video on your favorite unreleased console is unbelievable. There is a great big part of their users, fanbase and community which rely on the pre evaluations they put out even in their directs. I dont agree with your point of view at all. Some people make purchasing decisions of of this sort of information. Even if its early information. Honestly this is cringe inducing. 'Won't anyone think of poor Nintendo' vibes. It's a reaction video. They've said this much. Let it go bro. Wait for proper analysis when games become available and then you can criticize it all over again if that's the case. Is Switch 2 really 3.1TF in docked mode? The Switch 2 is going to sell out for months or years on end anyway, whether DF is only positive instead of supremely hyped or not. There's no meaningful damage that could be done even if we were to assume the PS4 comparisons were legitimately outrageous. This thread still going strong huh? See the positive side of things: this binds the console warriors to this thread as they spent their days feeling compelled to just write one more reply, going in circles eternally. This thread is like a honey trap and working like a charm! Page 3 See the positive side of things: this binds the console warriors to this thread as they spent their days feeling compelled to just write one more reply, going in circles eternally. This thread is like a honey trap and working like a charm! Lies, I've seen their tendrils in other threads. Though they tend to be told off, at least. My god the lengths some of you go to complain about a 1st inpressions DF video on your favorite unreleased console is unbelievable. Honestly this is cringe inducing. 'Won't anyone think of poor Nintendo' vibes. It's a reaction video. They've said this much. Let it go bro. Wait for proper analysis when games become available and then you can criticize it all over again if that's the case. Look for my purchasing i didnt care what df sayd in there podcast. i ordered my switch 2 regardless the day it went available because in the end that information dosnt even matter if you just want to play mario kart world and donkey kong bananza. I was just trying to give my thoughts why DF analysis is important and for some cases realy matters and influences people. And this even counts towards there podcasts. Last edited: May 10, 2025 it's incredibly funny to see people argue that all performance metrics can be flattened onto a one dimensional line, and therefore the switch 2 is more powerful than a ps4 and DF were being "dishonest" or "unprofessional". Sure are doing a lot of posting for someone that doesn't care what Digital Foundry said. The point is that I myself didnt make a purchasing decision off of this. Which maybe other people did or do. So what they say does have weight to it. Mistakes happen all the time thats clear but then explain what is happening. So that people understand what is making it hard to evaluate. Its just lacking some transparancy here. But i am signing off on this thread because i think that everything has been said at this point. And there is no point in feeding it anymore. The power point and tartget of the Switch 2 should be clear by now. And everyone should know what they are getting with the box and what techniques they will be using. Last edited: May 10, 2025 AncientReptileBrain said: it's incredibly funny to see people argue that all performance metrics can be flattened onto a one dimensional line, and therefore the switch 2 is more powerful than a ps4 and DF were being "dishonest" or "unprofessional". Literally taking a single metric (GPU raster) was how DF came to the conclusion Switch was only as powerful as PS4. And it turns out they were wrong on that anyway, unless they were talking only undocked. There's more hair dithering on Switch 2, otherwise it looks quite similar. The sequence where Cloud jumps from the train is intriguing, because it's 60fps (other snippets are 30.) If it was captured on Switch 2 then there's potential for a surprise. Literally taking a single metric (GPU raster) was how DF came to the conclusion Switch was only as powerful as PS4. And it turns out they were wrong on that anyway, unless they were talking only undocked. Even undocked it's still better. The 950/750 Ti is still able to run games at higher resolution and detail than the PS4 But we can compare it to Switch 1 and Switch 2 seems MUCH stronger than Switch 1.. Defiantly, GPU is around 6-7x stronger, CPU is around 10x stronger, it will have around 3.5x RAM memory available for games, 3-4x more RAM bandwidth, much faster storage, and on top of all that DLSS support that enables Switch 2 to punch above simple specs. So yeah, huge power difference, much bigger than going from PS4 to PS5, not to mention going from Switch to Wii U. Even undocked it's still better. The 950/750 Ti is still able to run games at higher resolution and detail than the PS4 Undocked, its not big power difference when comes to GPU, but still has much stronger CPU, much more RAM memory and faster storage. Last edited: May 10, 2025 Literally taking a single metric (GPU raster) was how DF came to the conclusion Switch was only as powerful as PS4. And it turns out they were wrong on that anyway, unless they were talking only undocked. GPU raster as in game performance. Not a single benchmark ran on simulated hardware. + They didn't say Switch 2 was as powerful as PS4 but that the performance in the games that were shown so far were in line with PS4, which is still quite true. GPU raster as in game performance. Not a single benchmark ran on simulated hardware. + They didn't say Switch 2 was as powerful as PS4 but that the performance in the games that were shown so far were in line with PS4, which is still quite true. They said Switch 2 games would be a "PS4 level experience", doubled down on it and cautioned to set expectations accordingly. They based this mainly on their pixel counts of initial canned trailers (which they claimed had no DLSS, we've since had multiple corrections to both res counts and DLSS) and I think also potentially holding too close to Rich's early 2050 testing (which Geekerwan replicated, but more thoroughly in clock and cache speeds and then actually benchmarked against a range of chips and devices). The 2050 sim is also not going to really be accurate (VRAM limited by comparison, totally different layout and cache) but it probably gives us a good floor to ballpark. Same deal with Geekerwan's A78AE sim (dual cluster, different optimizations). The floor here is going to be a significantly more technically capable architecture than PS4 (2x GPU docked, 3x CPU plus knowns like 2x RAM, fast storage and RT/ML cores). Which really, was what the spec leaks already told us more or less; above PS4 and below Series S. Last edited: May 10, 2025 GPU raster as in game performance. Not a single benchmark ran on simulated hardware. + They didn't say Switch 2 was as powerful as PS4 but that the performance in the games that were shown so far were in line with PS4, which is still quite true. It's sometimes true, it's a reach on both sides They said Switch 2 games would be a "PS4 level experience", doubled down on it and cautioned to set expectations accordingly. They based this mainly on their pixel counts of initial canned trailers (which they claimed had no DLSS, we've since had multiple corrections to both res counts and DLSS) and I think also potentially holding too close to Rich's early 2050 testing (which Geekerwan replicated, but more thoroughly in clock and cache speeds and then actually benchmarked against a range of chips and devices). The 2050 sim is also not going to really be accurate (VRAM limited by comparison) but it probably gives us a good floor to ballpark. Same deal with Geekerwan's A78AE sim (dual cluster). The floor here is going to be a significantly more technically capable architecture than PS4 (2x GPU docked, 3x CPU plus knowns like 2x RAM and RT/ML). Which really, was what the spec leaks already told us more or less; above PS4 and below Series S. They said the games shown so far gives a PS4 level experience. If anything, the few DLSS titles we saw such as Street Fighter 6 also points out to a PS4 experience. We know Switch 2 is more capable than PS4 at least docked. I don't know if it's two times, but close to it. The thing is, there are other aspects where it might be worse (such as memory bandwidth) which means in the end, it becomes more of a case by case basis. The gap isn't as extreme as it'll constantly outperform it by a good margin. I expect titles where Switch 2 will perform as well as PS4 Pro in gpu limited scénarios, thanks to DLSS. I expect titles where Switch 2 will perform better in cpu limited scenarios. I expect titles where Switch 2 will perform more like PS4 in some scenarios too. DF didn't make the statement you're claiming they did. They based that on games we saw, and so far, it remains true. We'll see at launch, when said titles are actually final. There'll be titles where Switch 2 outperform PS4, others where it'll perform the same. But overall, we'll have to see in the case Switch 2 outperforms it, to what extent and if it's enough to qualify these experiences beyond PS4 ballpark. They said the games shown so far gives a PS4 level experience. If anything, the few DLSS titles we saw such as Street Fighter 6 also points out to a PS4 experience. We know Switch 2 is more capable than PS4 at least docked. I don't know if it's two times, but close to it. The thing is, there are other aspects where it might be worse (such as memory bandwidth) which means in the end, it becomes more of a case by case basis. The gap isn't as extreme as it'll constantly outperform it by a good margin. I expect titles where Switch 2 will perform as well as PS4 Pro in gpu limited scénarios, thanks to DLSS. I expect titles where Switch 2 will perform better in cpu limited scenarios. I expect titles where Switch 2 will perform more like PS4 in some scenarios too. DF didn't make the statement you're claiming they did. They based that on games we saw, and so far, it remains true. We'll see at launch, when said titles are actually final. There'll be titles where Switch 2 outperform PS4, others where it'll perform the same. But overall, we'll have to see in the case Switch 2 outperforms it, to what extent and if it's enough to qualify these experiences beyond PS4 ballpark. SF6 is also a PS4 level experience on Series S in terms of resolution, worse really for asset clarity. Switch asset clarity is a step up from both at least in the early tests even at 1080p, we'll see how final code comes in and the real performance stress test (World Tour). Digital Foundry said exactly what I indicated; that Switch 2 is a PS4 level experience based on raster (it's not though, spec leaks and simulated testing show otherwise). Like almost word for word, we have Oliver's tweets reiterating this exact thing upthread. Trying to rewrite this is truly bizarre, it's what the entire thread is predicated on. SF6 is also a PS4 level experience on Series S in terms of resolution, worse really for asset clarity. Switch asset clarity is a step up from both at least in the early tests even at 1080p, we'll see how final code comes in and the real performance stress test (World Tour). Digital Foundry said exactly what I indicated; that Switch 2 is a PS4 level experience based on raster (it's not though, spec leaks and simulated testing show otherwise). Like almost word for word, we have Oliver's tweets reiterating this exact thing upthread. Trying to rewrite this is truly bizarre, it's what the entire thread is predicated on. Yes, SF6 is a PS4 level experience on Series S. Although the cut between PS4 and Series S is clearer in general. That remains to be seen for Switch 2. Althougb SF6 is an outlier for Series S in that case, considering how botched the port is. As for specs leak, as I said, it's not that simple. There might be cases where Switch 2 can suffer from the slower memory bandwidth. As for the simulated testing, it depends. Some fall in line with PS4, others beyond PS4. It's not as clear cut. And as I said, it's all about ballpark, or the closest comparison available. In term of performance, what was shown so far, at this time, is closer to PS4 than any other platform. It doesn't mean it'll always be the case. It is the case as of today, on a small selection of titles, that are yet to be released. That's the situation at this time. At no point DF says it'll always be the case or that it's 1:1. DF said that the visuals and experience on display from the titles they were shown was PS4 like. I dont think they've said anything wrong with that statement based on what we had seen and heard when they made their statements. We still don't have launch versions of games yet though. In these types of pre release media and pre release hands ons games are still hot and use outdated builds. As we get to release and after I think we'll see improvements. For the Switch 1, Odyssey was running at 720p in its reveal. At launch it was a dynamic 900p. Dragon Ball Xenoverse 2 was 720p in the direct trailer but dynamic 900p when it launched. There was a good chunk of software like that around launch. I expect the same thing here. We still haven't seen anything

outside of Star Wars Outlaws that uses a really current gen only feature set. So I think it is fair statement from DF. Even though the fidelity will be above PS4 in the end we still need to see more RT reflections, RTGI, nanite/mesh shaders etc to really see where the console pulls ahead. And we will I'm sure. But so far we dont have much. Yes, SF6 is a PS4 level experience on Series S. Although the cut between PS4 and Series S is clearer in general. That remains to be seen for Switch 2. Althougb SF6 is an outlier for Series S in that case, considering how botched the port is. As for specs leak, as I said, it's not that simple. There might be cases where Switch 2 can suffer from the slower memory bandwidth. As for the simulated testing, it depends. Some fall in line with PS4, others beyond PS4. It's not as clear cut. And as I said, it's all about ballpark, or the closest comparison available. In term of performance, what was shown so far, at this time, is closer to PS4 than any other platform. It doesn't mean it'll always be the case. It is the case as of today, on a small selection of titles, that are yet to be released. That's the situation at this time. At no point DF says it'll always be the case or that it's 1:1. Bandwidth could very well pose an issue (like it does on Deck) but that will depend on more than just RAM clocks (layout, caches, storage, etc). At this point though it's really just holding out for a negative, we don't have a real indication either way. It doesn't appear to be impacting early software at least, we're not seeing telltale signs of it like frame studder on alpha effects (fog, fire, etc) or anything. Also notable, CDPR confirms Switch 2 uses existing DLSS and not any custom "Lite" solution like some have speculated. De ontwikkelaars van Cyberpunk 2077 zijn helemaal klaar voor de lancering van Nintendo Switch 2. het spel heeft 'Gold'-status bereikt. Lees meer op N1-UP! n1up.nl Bandwidth could very well pose an issue (like it does on Deck) but that will depend on more than just RAM clocks (layout, caches, storage, etc). At this point though it's really just holding out for a negative, we don't have a real indication either way. It doesn't appear to be impacting early software at least, we're not seeing telltale signs of it like frame studder on alpha effects (fog, fire, etc) or anything. Also notable, CDPR confirms Switch uses existing DLSS and not any custom "Lite" solution like some have speculated. De ontwikkelaars van Cyberpunk 2077 zijn helemaal klaar voor de lancering van Nintendo Switch 2. het spel heeft 'Gold'-status bereikt. Lees meer op N1-UP! n1up.nl This is DLSS like PSSR, it's a fixed platform so they can tailor it to make it suitable Bandwidth could very well pose an issue (like it does on Deck) but that will depend on more than just RAM clocks (layout, caches, storage, etc). At this point though it's really just holding out for a negative, we don't have a real indication either way. It doesn't appear to be impacting early software at least, we're not seeing telltale signs of it like frame studder on alpha effects (fog, fire, etc) or anything. Also notable, CDPR confirms Switch 2 uses existing DLSS and not any custom "Lite" solution like some have speculated. De ontwikkelaars van Cyberpunk 2077 zijn helemaal klaar voor de lancering van Nintendo Switch 2. het spel heeft 'Gold'-status bereikt. Lees meer op N1-UP! n1up.nl We could be seeing it in the resolutions being targeted so far in some titles. In early trailers and old builds? Keep holding out I guess then... Hence why I'm using conditionnal. Hence why DF is also judging based on the games shown so far. It could change. It doesn't mean they'd suddenly be wrong. It just means the footage we have at this time is around that level. If footage at launch is at Series S level, it won't contradict that early footage was at PS4 level. This is DLSS like PSSR, it's a fixed platform so they can tailor it to make it suitable PSSR isn't fixed that way though afaik, it's also being fed into FSR4's models. CDPR is literally saying DLSS isn't segmented to the platform here. There's no "Switch 2 model". Hence why I'm using conditionnal. Hence why DF is also judging based on the games shown so far. It could change. It doesn't mean they'd suddenly be wrong. It just means the footage we have at this time is around that level. If footage at launch is at Series S level, it won't contradict that early footage was at PS4 level. I mean, they've already been wrong on the early footage itself too (standard DLSS, resolutions). That's why early pre-platform launch footage and trailers shouldn't be taken as gospel in general. Again, Mario Kart was supposedly 1080p with no AA back in January. Even with SF6, 540p resolving a higher clarity 1080p image isn't really a PS4 level experience either. For Phantom Liberty they had to say it's how you would expect last gen to perform, despite CDPR claiming it couldn't run on last gen at all. It's fine to couch this stuff, and I'd agree DF is always careful to do so, but their coverage has trended conservatively here and consistently held to a PS4 comparison that doesn't always make sense, with a lot of back-patting backwards reference to Rich's old 2050 testing. It's also an inconsistent approach versus what we saw from them with early coverage of other mobile hardware, like Vita or Deck, which tended to contrast with a variety of platforms at all levels and come to the "in between" conclusion that's missing here. Hopefully we do see more of that "in between" pivot with final code on final hardware. PSSR isn't fixed that way though afaik, it's also being fed into FSR4's models. CDPR is literally saying DLSS isn't segmented to the platform here. There's no "Switch 2 model". I mean, they've already been wrong on the early footage itself too (standard DLSS, resolutions). That's why early pre-platform launch footage and trailers shouldn't be taken as gospel in general. Again, Mario Kart was supposedly 1080p with no AA back in January. Even with SF6, 540p resolving a higher clarity 1080p image isn't really a PS4 level experience either. For Phantom Liberty they had to say it's how you would expect last gen to perform, despite CDPR claiming it couldn't run on last gen at all. It's fine to couch this stuff, and I'd agree DF is always careful to do so, but their coverage has trended conservatively here and consistently held to a PS4 comparison that doesn't always make sense, with a lot of back-patting backwards reference to Rich's old 2050 testing. It's also an inconsistent approach versus what we saw from them with early coverage of other mobile hardware, like Vita or Deck, which tended to contrast with a variety of platforms at all levels and come to the "in between" conclusion that's missing here. Hopefully we do see more of that "in between" pivot with final code on final hardware. Uh, SF6 is clearly a PS4 level experience. It resolving a marginally better image quality doesn't change the fact that it outputs at the same resolution, use the same kind of assets and settings too, based on the current footage. I wouldn't be surprised though if at launch, we'd see it bumped to 1440p, with 720p as native res before DLSS. As for not seeing DLSS, once again there's a lot of reasons for that. I suspect they didn't spent as much time on these analysis given the nature of the footage. There's also another reason, which is that I believe that at 1080p, people didn't expect DLSS to be used to reach that target. No one would've thought that SF6 would run at 540p internally to reach 1080p with DLSS, considering 14400 while docked seemed to be the kind of target you'd have if you were going over PS4 level. Uh, SF6 is clearly a PS4 level experience. It resolving a marginally better image quality doesn't change the fact that it outputs at the same resolution, use the same kind of assets and settings too, based on the current footage. I wouldn't be surprised though if at launch, we'd see it bumped to 1440p, with 720p as native res before DLSS. As for not seeing DLSS, once again there's a lot of reasons for that. I suspect they didn't spent as much time on these analysis given the nature of the footage. There's also another reason, which is that I believe that at 1080p, people didn't expect DLSS to be used to reach that target. No one would've thought that SF6 would run at 540p internally to reach 1080p with DLSS, considering 14400 while docked seemed to be the kind of target you'd have if you were going over PS4 level. I'm not sure claiming a cursory analysis based on preconceived notions is really the sort of defense against criticism of Digital Foundry you want to bring here? I'm not sure claiming a cursory analysis based on preconceived notions is really the sort of defense against criticism of Digital Foundry you want to bring here? Said criticism being that DF dared to say a game running at 1080p (same as PS4) with PS4 level of assets was PS4 ballpark in term of experience so far. When that criticism is that they didn't sugarcoat it to say "It's like a portable PS5 with cutback assets, textures, resolution, framerate etc", it's hard to take it seriously. Pretty incredible that folks are still putting the same handful of sentences and lines under a microscope lol. No one ever thought the Switch 2 would be 1:1 with the PS4 in any way, shape, or form. For one thing, it's unlikely for any given element to be an exact match, and for another, everyone's known from pretty much day 1 that the Switch 2 would have at least some notable points of distinction. In handheld, it's justttt above a PS4 in GPU performance, and below a Steam Deck. It's a good bit more powerful docked but still far below a Series S and massively below a PS5. CPU-wise, it's a very good improvement, but also a conservative one given that even the Steam Deck is in a much different weight class there. And going outside the realm of power level comparisons, the Switch 2 is just bringing a number of more modern touches across the board, from a screen capable of 120fps to DLSS capabilities. Folks should watch this tear down that dropped a few days ago: View: It's a very cool watch on multiple levels but it should be a sobering watch for people who hate PS4 and Switch 2 being mentioned in the same breath (and exciting for anyone operating with reasonable expectations). Some points: 1) GPU performance comparison: Switch 1 (handheld) 174, Switch 1 (docked) 317, PS4 1219, Switch 2 (handheld) 1308, Steam Deck 1443, Switch 2 (docked) 2205, Series S 3786, PS5 9590. 2) He also calls out NVIDIA's "10x more powerful" claim lol. 3) Dude found the Switch 2's CPU performance underwhelming but advised that most games/situations shouldn't be too CPU limited and used the PS4's much lower CPU power as a point of reference for that. 4) Leaks are looking to have been correct to an impressive degree. However, some blanks are still being filled in the above analysis, and so things like GPU performance aren't set in stone. 5) Games like Cyberpunk, Wukong, and Monster Hunter Wilds can run on the Switch 2 to varying but encouraging results (Wilds struggling, Wukong okay, Cyberpunk impressive) based on his simulation and should be even better with hardware-specific optimizations. Basically, Dictator's framing here is holding up nicely so far: Genuinely shocked people are somehow upset with the comparison to a PS4. We are talking about a max 30 ish watt ampere GPU on an outdated and more power hungry process. It cannot be Series S level, let alone PS5 level in a good number of categories. Even if ampere is a more forward looking architecture than RDNA 1.5/2 of the PS5, there are just hard wattage limits in play that are very important to its performance in spite of a nice feature set. Personally, I've said from the outset that my hope is for a system that is "meaningfully more powerful than a PS4 with a number of modern flourishes and reduced bottlenecks." That's shaping up to be exactly what the Switch 2 is but it does still make a lot of sense to use the PS4 as a point of comparison. Last edited: May 10, 2025 Said criticism being that DF dared to say a game running at 1080p (same as PS4) with PS4 level of assets was PS4 ballpark in term of experience so far. When that criticism is that they didn't sugarcoat it to say "It's like a portable PS5 with cutback assets, textures, resolution, framerate etc", it's hard to take it seriously. That's not what i said about Phantom Liberty? Nice PS5 strawman. PSSR isn't fixed that way though afaik, it's also being fed into FSR4's models. CDPR is literally saying DLSS isn't segmented to the platform here. There's no "Switch 2 model". I mean, they've already been wrong on the early footage itself too (standard DLSS, resolutions). That's why early pre-platform launch footage and trailers shouldn't be taken as gospel in general. Again, Mario Kart was supposedly 1080p with no AA back in January. Even with SF6, 540p resolving a higher clarity 1080p image isn't really a PS4 level experience either. For Phantom Liberty they had to say it's how you would expect last gen to perform, despite CDPR claiming it couldn't run on last gen at all. It's fine to couch this stuff, and I'd agree DF is always careful to do so, but their coverage has trended conservatively here and consistently held to a PS4 comparison that doesn't always make sense, with a lot of back-patting backwards reference to Rich's old 2050 testing. It's also an inconsistent approach versus what we saw from them with early coverage of other mobile hardware, like Vita or Deck, which tended to contrast with a variety of platforms at all levels and come to the "in between" conclusion that's missing here. Hopefully we do see more of that "in between" pivot with final code on final hardware. Yes but there is only one switch, so it will be tailored obviously Yes but there is only one switch, so it will be tailored obviously Oh sure, having one (well two, or more if they want) performance targets will always help optimization. The key thing though is that there isn't a Switch 2, Lite or custom model they're using, it's regular DLSS. Oh sure, having one (well two, or more if they want) performance targets will always help optimization. The key thing though is that there isn't a Switch 2, Lite or custom model they're using, it's regular DLSS. It is, but it may not be. It's been ported or adapted to this new hardware, it's not running on an RTX product DF said that the visuals and experience on display from the titles they were shown was PS4 like. I dont think they've said anything wrong with that statement based on what we had seen and heard when they made their statements. Look at headline of this thread, they basically said that with Switch 2 hardware "you can expect is a PS4 level experience", that sounds like we can generally expecting PS4 level experience from Switch 2 hardware, not that only 1st footage showing PS4 level experience. Maybe Youtube compression is partially responsible for my conclusion here but in motion, I'd be lying if I said I noticed a single difference. Other then frame rate they look pretty much the same, if you look close enough at the hair then thats the only other difference. How the game was captured will make all the difference in the world here especially with youtube compression. There should be a bigger difference here given that its 1512p 60 vs 1080p 30, even with youtube compression there should still be a bigger difference. Oh sure, having one (well two, or more if they want) performance targets will always help optimization. The key thing though is that there isn't a Switch 2, Lite or custom model they're using, it's regular DLSS. I think you're making a big assumption there. There's no guarantee that it'll be using the same model, just because it's implemented by developers in the same way. After all, even on the PC, there is no one singular model for DLSS upscaling, and everything since DLSS 2 is freely interchangeable (both different versions and different models), even the new transformer model. AI is fundamentally a black box after all. I think you're making a big assumption there. There's no guarantee that it'll be using the same model, just because it's implemented by developers in the same way. After all, even on the PC, there is no one singular model for DLSS upscaling, and everything since DLSS 2 is freely interchangeable (both different versions and different models), even the new transformer model. AI is fundamentally a black box after all. CDPR confirmed it's the same model in the interview I linked. It'd be their assumption, not mine. Pretty incredible that folks are still putting the same handful of sentences and lines under a microscope lol. No one ever thought the Switch 2 would be 1:1 with the PS4 in any way, shape, or form. For one thing, it's unlikely for any given element to be an exact match, and for another, everyone's known from pretty much day 1 that the Switch 2 would have at least some notable points of distinction. In handheld, it's justttt above a PS4 in GPU performance, and below a Steam Deck. It's a good bit more powerful docked but still far below a Series S and massively below a PS5. CPU-wise, it's a very good improvement, but also a conservative one given that even the Steam Deck is in a much different weight class there. And going outside the realm of power level comparisons, the Switch 2 is just bringing a number of more modern touches across the board, from a screen capable of 120fps to DLSS capabilities. Its a very informative video and the benchmarks are accurate, but the simulated consoles don't actually represent real work performance so I wouldn't put much stock in to those. For example the PS4 GPU is similar to a HD 7850/7870 but both of them perform much worse then a real PS4 in modern games, even with lower settings. CDPR confirmed it's the same model in the interview I linked. You're assuming they're talking about the model. They don't use that word at all. And from the context -- that it's been very easy for them to implement DLSS on the Switch 2 as it's the same as how they do it on the PC -- it makes more sense that they're talking about the API being the same rather than the model itself. After all, like I say, there's a whole bunch of different DLSS upscaling models on the PC already, and all of them share the same interface on the developer side. Look at headline of this thread, they basically said that with Switch 2 hardware "you can expect is a PS4 level experience", that sounds like we can generally expecting PS4 level experience from Switch 2 hardware, not that only 1st footage showing PS4 level experience. What about reading the whole post? «"It's got all of the modern features: ray tracing support, mesh shaders, everything that a 30 series class Nvidia card...this can do, just with a much lower level of overall performance." It's ps4 level in a similar way that the s1 is 360 level. It has all the features of current gen consoles and more, with ps4+ level raw grunt. Which is pretty good for the form factor. That looks stunning.... people sometimes forget we're talking about a 30w system here. All things considered the system seems to be capable of pushing gorgeous looking graphics....this is a frickin handheld hooked up to a tv guys...we've come a long way from the game boy/ DS times For sure. To be fair to the GB/DS lines, though... the Switch 2 is gonna be $450. The Switch 1 was priced like a console, too. As a product line, it's set up from the ground-up to be a proper successor to Nintendo's console lineage. Grabbing a DS for $150 or whatever the price was, putting it in your pocket, having access to a software library tailored specifically for the handheld experience... it's just a different vibe across the board lol. CDPR confirmed it's the same model in the interview I linked. It'd be their assumption, not mine. This doesn't read as confirmation to me: "Cyberpunk 2077 uses DLSS (Deep Learning Super Sampling), a built-in AI technology that can render higher-resolution images with less processing power. According to the developer present at the Switch 2 event, it was fairly simple to implement. After all, it's not a "special Nintendo DLSS technique," but the same Nvidia DLSS technique the team has worked with before. The developer also felt it was important to note that DLSS is not a silver bullet, and that developers still need to be careful with the technical "budget" of the Switch 2 hardware." Hard to know what's being lost in translation, if anything, but requiring the same approach doesn't mean it's the same model. Its a very informative video and the benchmarks are accurate, but the simulated consoles don't actually represent real work performance so I wouldn't put much stock in to those. For example the PS4 GPU is similar to a HD 7850/7870 but both of them perform much worse then a real PS4 in modern games, even with lower settings. Good point. Yeah, he does mention that those games should look better and be more performant on the actual device, given that developers will be able to optimize for it and implement techniques like dynamic scaling. What about reading the whole post? «"It's got all of the modern features: ray tracing support, mesh shaders, everything that a 30 series class Nvidia card...this can do, just with a much lower level of overall performance." It's ps4 level in a similar way that the s1 is 360 level. It has all the features of current gen consoles and more, with ps4+ level raw grunt. Which is pretty good for the form factor. They said all that, but despite that, they said like conclusion "you can expect is a PS4 level experience". You're assuming they're talking about the model. They don't use that word at all. And from the context -- that it's been very easy for them to implement DLSS on the Switch 2 as it's the same as how they do it on the PC -- it makes more sense that they're talking about the API being the same rather than the model itself. After all, like I say, there's a whole bunch of different DLSS upscaling models on the PC already, and all of them share the same interface on the developer side. This doesn't read as confirmation to me: "Cyberpunk 2077 uses DLSS (Deep Learning Super Sampling), a built-in AI technology that can render higher-resolution images with less processing power. According to the developer present at the Switch 2 event, it was fairly simple to implement. After all, it's not a "special Nintendo DLSS technique," but the same Nvidia DLSS technique the team has worked with before. The developer also felt it was important to note that DLSS is not a silver bullet, and that developers still need to be careful with the technical "budget" of the Switch 2 hardware." Hard to know what's being lost in translation, if anything, but requiring the same approach doesn't mean it's the same model. Right, and you choose the model within that API. CDPR is saying it's the same here on Switch 2, the same as PC, there's nothing different or custom to the platform from what they're saying. That was likely the point, they're refuting the speculation on Switch 2 running some custom "DLSS Lite". Page 4 For sure. To be fair to the GB/DS lines, though... the Switch 2 is gonna be $450. The Switch 1 was priced like a console, too. As a product line, it's set up from the ground-up to be a proper successor to Nintendo's console lineage. Grabbing a DS for $150 or whatever the price was, putting it in your pocket, having access to a software library tailored specifically for the handheld experience... it's just a different vibe across the board lol. This doesn't read as confirmation to me: "Cyberpunk 2077 uses DLSS (Deep Learning Super Sampling), a built-in AI technology that can render higher-resolution images with less processing power. According to the developer present at the Switch 2 event, it was fairly simple to implement. After all, it's not a "special Nintendo DLSS technique," but the same Nvidia DLSS technique the team has worked with before. The developer also felt it was important to note that DLSS is not a silver bullet, and that developers still need to be careful with the technical "budget" of the Switch 2 hardware." Hard to know what's being lost in translation, if anything, but requiring the same approach doesn't mean it's the same model. Good point. Yeah, he does mention that those games should look better and be more performant on the actual device, given that developers will be able to optimize for it and implement techniques like dynamic scaling. This is true especially for switch 2 software given that its a dedicated portable system, devs will be able to get more out of the hardware then something like a phone or something that is using similar hardware. But the benchmarks for the switch 2 will be more accurate given that its much newer hardware, while support for a HD 7870 is no longer supported. For sure. To be fair to the GB/DS lines, though... the Switch 2 is gonna be $450. The Switch 1 was priced like a console, too. As a product line, it's set up from the ground-up to be a proper successor to Nintendo's console lineage. Grabbing a DS for $150 or whatever the price was, putting it in your pocket, having access to a software library tailored specifically for the handheld experience... it's just a different vibe across the board lol. People will pay a premium for portability. There is a huge audience who still wants tethered consoles, but it's arguable that the market for portable and hybrid hardware is bigger these days. And to get similar performance on hardware using a battery is not cheap anymore. They said all that, but despite that, they said like conclusion "you can expect is a PS4 level experience". If ps4 had mesh shaders, rt cores, more memory, dedicated decompression hardware, dlss etc. This thing is obviously way more capable of getting current gen ports than a ps4 is. But the benchmarks for the switch 2 will be more accurate given that its much newer hardware, while support for a HD 7870 is no longer supported. That's debatable since the benchmarks aren't of actual Switch 2 hardware or even chips derived from them. Switch 2's GPU isn't a downclocked 2050 and it's CPU isn't a dual quad-core A78AE. Right, and you choose the model within that API. CDPR is saying it's the same here on Switch 2, the same as PC, there's nothing different or custom to the platform from what they're saying. That was likely the point, they're refuting the speculation on Switch 2 running some custom "DLSS Lite". I don't know how much more clear I can be! The model is a black box which can be switched out. The games themselves have zero knowledge of the details of the upscaling model being used. If Nintendo did use a customised model, it would not change anything about the way it's implemented by game developers. I don't know if they will use a customised version or not (nor do I think it would be a bad thing if they did), but this simply isn't evidence to point one way or the other. That's debatable since the benchmarks aren't of actual Switch 2 hardware or even chips derived from them. Switch 2's GPU isn't a downclocked 2050 and it's CPU isn't a dual quad-core A78AE. I mean the synthetic benchmarks, the games benchmark are fine, but like he said in the video devs should be able to get more from the hardware. Its not 1 to 1 hardware but should give you a ball park idea where Switch 2 software will land if you factor in that switch 2 will do better then the simulated hardware. Also he didn't use a dual core a78 CPU, he said 8 core in the video. The A78c cores should outperform the AE cores but likely not by a lot. Not enough to negate his benchmarks. Last edited: May 10, 2025 For me they could have shaved 30$ off and kept it at a 60 hz screen. I dont get what they want to do with 120hz in the slightest. The only thing i can think of is keep switch 1 graphics and fire them out at 120. But that would suck in my opinion. Imo VRR (G-sync) is the important bit here. 120hz is more a byproduct of having a vrr screen. There will be plenty of games that don't consistently hit their framerate target, and for those g-sync will make a huge difference. Starting with Barrett asking Cloud to come down from the train, it's all real time. Only the travelling aroung Midgar at the very beginning is pre rendered. Damn.. but maybe they changed it for the Switch 2 version? Hellblade 1 on Switch also had video files instead real time graphics. I don't know how much more clear I can be! The model is a black box which can be switched out. The games themselves have zero knowledge of the details of the upscaling model being used. If Nintendo did use a customised model, it would not change anything about the way it's implemented by game developers. I don't know if they will use a customised version or not (nor do I think it would be a bad thing if they did), but this simply isn't evidence to point one way or the other. You don't need to dig into the code to know your model. There's is room for interpretation based on what "DLSS technique" means in context (maybe a native polish speaker could help here?) but I sort doubt they just mean the same SDK/plugin. No one's speculating about a different API. Pretty incredible that folks are still putting the same handful of sentences and lines under a microscope lol. No one ever thought the Switch 2 would be 1:1 with the PS4 in any way, shape, or form. For one thing, it's unlikely for any given element to be an exact match, and for another, everyone's known from pretty much day 1 that the Switch 2 would have at least some notable points of distinction. In handheld, it's justttt above a PS4 in GPU performance, and below a Steam Deck. It's a good bit more powerful docked but still far below a Series S and massively below a PS5. CPU-wise, it's a very good improvement, but also a conservative one given that even the Steam Deck is in a much different weight class there. And going outside the realm of power level comparisons, the Switch 2 is just bringing a number of more modern touches across the board, from a screen capable of 120fps to DLSS capabilities. Folks should watch this tear down that dropped a few days ago: View: It's a very cool watch on multiple levels but it should be a sobering watch for people who hate PS4 and Switch 2 being mentioned in the same breath (and exciting for anyone operating with reasonable expectations). Some points: 1) GPU performance comparison: Switch 1 (handheld) 174, Switch 1 (docked) 317, PS4 1219, Switch 2 (handheld) 1308, Steam Deck 1443, Switch 2 (docked) 2205, Series S 3786, PS5 9590. 2) He also calls out NVIDIA's "10x more powerful" claim lol. 3) Dude found the Switch 2's CPU performance underwhelming but advised that most games/situations shouldn't be too CPU limited and used the PS4's much lower CPU power as a point of reference for that. 4) Leaks are looking to have been correct to an impressive degree. However, some blanks are still being filled in the above analysis, and so things like GPU performance aren't set in stone. 5) Games like Cyberpunk, Wukong, and Monster Hunter Wilds can run on the Switch 2 to varying but encouraging results (Wilds struggling, Wukong okay, Cyberpunk impressive) based on his simulation and should be even better with hardware-specific optimizations. Basically, Dictator's framing here is holding up nicely so far: Personally, I've said from the outset that my hope is for a system that is "meaningfully more powerful than a PS4 with a number of modern flourishes and reduced bottlenecks." That's shaping up to be exactly what the Switch 2 is but it does still make a lot of sense to use the PS4 as a point of comparison. Thanks for the link to the video, it was an interesting watch. I vividly remember the torrent of crap thrown at DF's way when they dared suggest that the Switch 2 SOC would be fabricated under Samsung's 8nm process. I visited Famiboards and read pages upon pages of forum 'experts' confidently proclaiming that Digital Foundry was super wrong while posting 'irrefutable evidence' that shot down DF's claims. Time, it seems, is a flat circle. Thanks for the link to the video, it was an interesting watch. I vividly remember the torrent of crap thrown at DF's way when they dared suggest that the Switch 2 SOC would be fabricated under Samsung's 8nm process. I visited Famiboards and read pages upon pages of forum 'experts' confidently proclaiming that Digital Foundry was super wrong while posting 'irrefutable evidence' that shot down DF's claims. Time, it seems, is a flat circle. I also recall TDP experts here claiming it'd be weaker than a Deck, docked, based on 8N, handheld wattage and "the laws of physics" or something. It was the same rationale, 8nm/10nm just isn't an efficient node. That it appears to be 8N (or maybe a custom revision of) and getting the kind of performance it's showing is actually remarkable. Last edited: May 10, 2025 Thanks for the link to the video, it was an interesting watch. I vividly remember the torrent of crap thrown at DF's way when they dared suggest that the Switch 2 SOC would be fabricated under Samsung's 8nm process. I visited Famiboards and read pages upon pages of forum 'experts' confidently proclaiming that Digital Foundry was super wrong while posting 'irrefutable evidence' that shot down DF's claims. Time, it seems, is a flat circle. Tbf Switch 2s power efficiency is extremely good compared to other ampere products. And it has a bigger battery + worse battery life than a launch Switch 1. Look at headline of this thread, they basically said that with Switch 2 hardware "you can expect is a PS4 level experience", that sounds like we can generally expecting PS4 level experience from Switch 2 hardware, not that only 1st footage showing PS4 level experience. Yeah, if I didn't actually watch the content and instead posted based on out of context snippets I too would understand why your so tilted about this. Good thing I didn't do that shit. Yeah, if I didn't actually watch the content and instead posted based on out of context snippets I too would understand why your so tilted about this. Good thing I didn't do that shit. Actually I did watch whole video, and yes, this thread naming basically represents feeling that I also got from their hole video and their conclusions, and thats why I disagree with DF.. Unless I have it wrong, DF are saying it's a PS4 level experience from a graphics stand point? which it is. So what's the issue? Unless I have it wrong, DF are saying it's a PS4 level experience from a graphics stand point? which it is. So what's the issue? A handful of people have more or less been in violent agreement with each other for 2,000+ posts and refuse to admit it. Everyone agrees it lands somewhere between a PS4 and a Series S but for some reason won't accept that as a good enough conclusion. Thanks for the link to the video, it was an interesting watch. I vividly remember the torrent of crap thrown at DF's way when they dared suggest that the Switch 2 SOC would be fabricated under Samsung's 8nm process. I visited Famiboards and read pages upon pages of forum 'experts' confidently proclaiming that Digital Foundry was super wrong while posting 'irrefutable evidence' that shot down DF's claims. Time, it seems, is a flat circle. You conveniently left out that some of these people were not 'confidently proclaiming' that DF was wrong, since they themselves did not rule out 8nm. They were criticising DF's and other PC enthusiasts' usual 'Because Nintendo' conclusions on why it would be 8nm because they made no sense and still don't. As if to say that Nintendo forced Nvidia to go with a cheap process or some such nonsense. The screen would probably be some cheap LCD and will never be 120fps. Why? Because Nintendo. It was the arguments for 8nm that were criticised, not the conclusion that it would be 8nm. I also find it funny how you prop up DF by insulting these Famiboards 'experts', as you so sarcastically put it, when DF got Switch 2's information (data, findings, etc.) from one of their members without even bothering to credit him specifically for all the findings or acknowledge his own take. I'm sure DF are knowledgable people, but so are many people on Famiboards and other forums. Just because someone posts on forum does not make them fanboys or less knowledgable than DF. Last edited: May 10, 2025 Imo VRR (G-sync) is the important bit here. 120hz is more a byproduct of having a vrr screen. There will be plenty of games that don't consistently hit their framerate target, and for those g-sync will make a huge difference. VRR working only on portable mode really limits the potentials tho. Just finished watching this and my goodness is the Switch 2 blowing my mind. Prior to the reveal I would have thought none of this was possible but here we are. Putting the game side-by-side with a console juggernaut in the PS5, really demonstrates how amazing the tech under the hood really is considering the fact that I'm going to be able to have experiences like this in a portable form factor. The comments in the video and some others I've watched are remarkably positive with many untrained eyes saying they see little to no difference. I agree, I'm having to dissect the video with still frames many times. I suspect the average gamer will not care. I still disagree with Digital Foundry's doubled down statement of "expecting a PS4 like experience" when at launch we are already seeing games that the PS4 could not handle (CP2077 DLC). That alone says I can expect a better than PS4 experience. Especially considering that these are launch titles. Once developers really get a handle on the hardware, things are only going to improve. Actually I did watch whole video, and yes, this thread naming basically represents feeling that I also got from their hole video and their conclusions, and thats why I disagree with DF.. If you take a 30fps PS4 game and run it up to 60fps, you are getting the same visual experience which is why their statement makes sense in context. I am having a hard time believing that people see this as a negative, unless you were imagining the hardware being close to a PS5, which some were definitely doing. Independent of anything else going on in this topic: You don't process fps with your ears. 30fps vs 60fps is a different visual experience. And this is why it upsets you. You're choosing to misunderstand the message. They're saying the games broadly look like what the PS4 could do, which they absolutely do. I think Switch 2 will be a Smash Hit. Goddamn... Actually I did watch whole video, and yes, this thread naming basically represents feeling that I also got from their hole video and their conclusions, and thats why I disagree with DF.. If that's what you got that you didn't actually listen to the video or any of their other videos properly because they have been pretty clear with their words. Like I said, their sentiment has been that the visuals and experience on display from the titles they were shown or have seen was PS4 like. They have pointed to several areas where it has been PS4 like or above but nothing crazy thus far. If you are getting something extremely different, that's on you. I also recall TDP experts here claiming it'd be weaker than a Deck, docked, based on 8N, handheld wattage and "the laws of physics" or something. It was the same rationale, 8nm/10nm just isn't an efficient node. That it appears to be 8N (or maybe a custom revision of) and getting the kind of performance it's showing is actually remarkable. Then we agree that random forum posters without any credentials shouldn't be considered as reliable sources, certainly not over DF. Tbf Switch 2s power efficiency is extremely good compared to other ampere products. And it has a bigger battery + worse battery life than a launch Switch 1. Nevertheless, I like the system a lot from a power and balance perspective. You conveniently left out that some of these people were not 'confidently proclaiming' that DF was wrong, since they themselves did not rule out 8nm. They were criticising DF's and other PC enthusiasts' usual 'Because Nintendo' conclusions on why it would be 8nm because they made no sense and still don't. As if to say that Nintendo forced Nvidia to go with a cheap process or some such nonsense. The screen would probably be some cheap LCD and will never be 120fps. Why? Because Nintendo. It was the arguments for 8nm that were criticised, not the conclusion that it would be 8nm. I also find it funny how you prop up DF by insulting these Famiboards 'experts', as you so sarcastically put it, when DF got Switch 2's information (data, findings, etc.) from one of their members without even bothering to credit him specifically for all the findings or acknowledge his own take. I'm sure DF are knowledgable people, but so are many people on Famiboards and other forums. Just because someone posts on forum does not make them fanboys or less knowledgable than DF. Perhaps not, but forum posters have to prove themselves and DF already has, not only in terms of knowledge but also impartiality. When DF makes a statement or prediction I hold it in high regard because they are professionals who have a proven track record of objectivity. I can't say the same for random forum posters. I am open to it but it's a much steeper hill to gain my trust. I think Switch 2 will be a Smash Hit. Goddamn... i notice the difference in lighting, but it's so slight/different that i'm not remotely bothered by it at all. i know there are cutbacks (mainly resolution/frame rate), but the fact that it's anywhere near spitting distance of ps5 is incredible imo. black magic indeed The eventual Rebirth comparison will probably be fairly interesting considering how bad the IQ is on base consoles due to the scaling/AA/etc solutions. Likely they are using DLSS so I'm curious what scaling factor they are using to get this image because it's quite good. Is that FF 7 Intergrade (the first one)? Eurogamer noted in the Rebirth article for PS5 pro that the base console seemed to only be using a spatial upscaler (worse IQ than currently available methods), so I'm guessing Intergrade did similar on PS5: Digital Foundry says that Final Fantasy 7 Rebirth has a night and day improvement to image quality over base PS5 in the all-important 60fps performance mode. www.eurogamer.net ....That's very similar to the resolution range of the base game, which hit comparable resolution figures in its performance mode. However, the base console didn't use any form of temporal upsampling, instead taking that final rendered image and simply upscaling it, perhaps using a bilinear or bicubic upscaling solution. The game's final resolve also appeared oddly soft, lacking detail relative to some other games with similar resolutions...... It might be another situation like SF6 where the original console release didn't have a good upscaling option (even though the console could technically support it), but the dev seemingly added one for the Switch 2 port. Comparison pics are probably more an indictment of TAA or old upscaling methods compared to better upscaling options available now, rather than a power comparison. If you take a 30fps PS4 game and run it up to 60fps, you are getting the same visual experience which is why their statement makes sense in context. I am having a hard time believing that people see this as a negative, unless you were imagining the hardware being close to a PS5, which some were definitely doing. If you are getting 60 fps instead of 30 fps, or higher resolution, than you clearly getting better experience, not same. Its not like we have only PS4 and PS5 for comparison, we also have PS4 Pro and Series S. DLSS should give a better result than the awful blocky upscale they used on PS5 at least. It will but if the cut to resolution for output is too much it won't save the game in question and just leaves a softened image still. The further you are from the target especially after 30 to 50% the worst it makes the tech no matter what solution is deployed. You can cheat this system but it costs overhead and vram to get more stability or clarity. Last edited: May 10, 2025 Perhaps not, but forum posters have to prove themselves and DF already has, not only in terms of knowledge but also impartiality. When DF makes a statement or prediction I hold it in high regard because they are professionals who have a proven track record of objectivity. I can't say the same for random forum posters. I am open to it but it's a much steeper hill to gain my trust. This I highly subjective due to their field of expertise. Video game analysis is probably one of the most difficult fields to perform repeatable tests under the exact same conditions. It varies from game to game. I agree with the rest of your statement though. Do we know is the dock will do integer scalling from 1080p to 4k? Because many tvs still do not have that feature. Is that FF 7 Intergrade (the first one)? Eurogamer noted in the Rebirth article for PS5 pro that the base console seemed to only be using a spatial upscaler (worse IQ than currently available methods), so I'm guessing Intergrade did similar on PS5: Digital Foundry says that Final Fantasy 7 Rebirth has a night and day improvement to image quality over base PS5 in the all-important 60fps performance mode. www.eurogamer.net It might be another situation like SF6 where the original console release didn't have a good upscaling option (even though the console could technically support it), but the dev seemingly added one for the Switch 2 port. Comparison pics are probably more an indictment of TAA or old upscaling methods compared to better upscaling options available now, rather than a power comparison. Thanks for the sharing the link to that DF article. It will but if the cut to resolution for output is too much it won't save the game in question and just leaves a softened image still. The further you are from the target especially after 30 to 50% the worst it makes the tech no matter what solution is deployed. You can cheat this system but it costs overhead and vram to get more stability or clarity. Since the base PS5 went down to 1080p in performance mode (afaik), and the Switch 2 is estimated to be around 1/4th the graphical power of that system, could 512p DLSS to 720-1080p with reasonable optimizations be a possible option? Since the base PS5 went down to 1080p in performance mode (afaik), and the Switch 2 is estimated to be around 1/4th the graphical power of that system, could 512p DLSS to 720-1080p with reasonable optimizations be a possible option? Since the "banned" game is 1440p output resolution docked, maybe that's a possibility as well for Remake (and even a 1080p 40fps docked if they propose a performance mode) and 720p internal -> 1080p output undocked. I also recall TDP experts here claiming it'd be weaker than a Deck, docked, based on 8N, handheld wattage and "the laws of physics" or something. It was the same rationale, 8nm/10nm just isn't an efficient node. That it appears to be 8N (or maybe a custom revision of) and getting the kind of performance it's showing is actually remarkable. Most people said undocked. Not docked, since docked likely allow for 30W if not more on Switch 2. If someone said docked, they're not serious. I think Switch 2 will be a Smash Hit. Goddamn... A word of caution regarding the first two screens. That particular clip in the developer interview was randomly running at 60fps while all other clips we've seen of the game are capped at 30fps. I'd take those particular comparisons with a grain of salt, as they might not actually be Switch 2 footage. I don't think it's quality and performance mode either, as the clip arguably has as good if not better image quality than the rest of the footage. Page 5 A word of caution regarding the first two screens. That particular clip in the developer interview was randomly running at 60fps while all other clips we've seen of the game are capped at 30fps. I'd take those particular comparisons with a grain of salt, as they might not actually be Switch 2 footage. I don't think it's quality and performance mode either, as the clip arguably has as good if not better image quality than the rest of the footage. This applies to all pre launch comparisons imo. Everything that was at the demo events was workin progress. Same for trailers. Then we agree that random forum posters without any credentials shouldn't be considered as reliable sources, certainly not over DF. Generally sure but the Famiboards hardware thread is where basically every credible leak about the system originated. Even DF credits them. Most people said undocked. Not docked, since docked likely allow for 30W if not more on Switch 2. If someone said docked, they're not serious. Either way, docked or undocked, the system is turning out more performant than expected on 8N. There is really something funny about getting the actual numbers from someone who acquired the board and does a ton of work to figure out how it performs (not great, but roughly in line with what reasonable people would expect - except for the CPU performance, which is dreadful) and people ignoring that and posting random bullshots of a PS4 game and hoping for ports of visually impressive/CPU demanding current gen games. You're setting yourself up for failure! Generally sure but the Famiboards hardware thread is where basically every credible leak about the system originated. Even DF credits them. Either way, docked or undocked, the system is turning out more performant than expected on 8N. I feel like the system is ending up where it was expected at that TDP, specs and process node. I feel like the system is ending up where it was expected at that TDP, specs and process node. I disagree. TDP: Not many people expected a substantially higher tdp than S1 Erista. Specs and process node: You told people it was 8nm and had a tdp of 10W for the whole system , a 1,7 tflop gpu would have seemed way out of reach. Nvidia engineers has performed magic with what they had. There is really something funny about getting the actual numbers from someone who acquired the board and does a ton of work to figure out how it performs (not great, but roughly in line with what reasonable people would expect - except for the CPU performance, which is dreadful) and people ignoring that and posting random bullshots of a PS4 game and hoping for ports of visually impressive/CPU demanding current gen games. You're setting yourself up for failure! You could have said the same at the launch of a Switch 1, yet a good number of ambitious last gen games has ended up on the system. I disagree. TDP: Not many people expected a substantially higher tdp than S1 Erista. Specs and process node: You told people it was 8nm and had a tdp of 10W for the whole system , a 1,7 tflop gpu would have seemed way out of reach. Nvidia engineers has performed magic with what they had. Because it's not a 1.7 tflops GPU in the same sense as other consoles GPUs. The same way Rog Ally X isn't really a 8 Tflops GPU. I feel like the system is ending up where it was expected at that TDP, specs and process node. Well, TDP concerns became irrelevant anyway once the clocks leaked awhile back. Around 2X PS4 GPU raster might've been within some expectations but it definitely wasn't everyone. That's interesting to know, thank you. It's not their leaks I am questioning though, it's the analysis that follows them. There is a lot of good analysis in those threads too. Some also supported 10nm derived nodes as a possibility, what led to doubt was generally the low efficiency that node could deliver versus what was known about the system spec but not everyone ruled out 8N. 8N isn't confirmed either really now, we just have a deeper analysis ruling out 5nm based nodes but it could also be another process revision of 10nm. Like the Korean business leak last year that named a custom process previously unheard of: 7LPH. You could have said the same at the launch of a Switch 1, yet a good number of ambitious last gen games has ended up on the system. It is crazy how people saying "it is impossible" about a console not even out and games not even released is the default reasonable position lol. I'm happy to just wait and see what happens. Takes nothing to not be overly optimistic or pessimistic. The amount of times people on Era have been wrong about Switch 2 in the last 4 weeks tells me that time is a much better judge of reality than forum posts. I strongly disagree, it's way, way too soon to make such a claim with any amount of confidence. Not only because the Switch 2 is a powerful and well-balanced system, but also because the market isn't the same as it was back when the Switch launched. Nintendo was coming off of the WiiU and no one knew the next console's sales potential. Back then the market was all about home consoles and the handheld form factor had been pronounced dead. Today, growth in home consoles has stalled and handhelds have established themselves as a very important market, largely thanks to Nintendo. As far as we know every platform holder is developing a handheld, which means that publishers and developers will have a very big audience to target with their games and everyone is now aware of the Switch 2's sales potential. My prediction is that in the next few years we will see many multiplatform games that scale well to handhelds, certainly much more so than the current crop of AAA that were designed with PS5 and XSX as the development target. Apologies for the SUPER late reply (holy shit, this thread is still going), but my claim is predicated on... every Nintendo system's 3P sales since probably the SNES. I understand that you think (and I ardently agree! It was the whole reason for me replying about the fact that) the system is capable, but my argument from the start - with a bizarre accusation of console warring when I made it plain that the PS4 comparison was apt - has been that a look at the top... 20? 30? best sellers? on Switch are almost nothing but Nintendo games. There are plenty of Switch games, but they don't sell like Nintendo games. I think someone posted a chart that included a very cute set of games, but they are not the ones you find on other platforms' sales charts (other than Minecraft, maybe? I don't think even that's up there anymore). I'm honestly confused that this thread is still going, because basic evidence makes my original statement just as true as it was the first time: a portable PS4 is insane given what that system put out. I fully expect it to be capable of the kind of fidelity of a Horizon or Last of Us Part II. But I don't expect it to produce many non-MonHun-level hits for big publishers. I think it will get some really technically impressive ports from devs that care, but I don't think they'll match the sales of Nintendo games, for which you buy a Nintendo system. Nintendo fans are getting so impossibly fucked up over a comparison to a system that, to this day, in 2025, more than A DECADE AFTER IT WAS RELEASED, still looks modern. And you'll be holding that in your hands in like a month. You'll just be playing mostly Nintendo games on it in two years because that's all anyone's gonna buy outside of eShop indie pick-ups. There is a lot of good analysis in those threads too. Some also supported 10nm derived nodes as a possibility, what led to doubt was generally the low efficiency that node could deliver versus what was known about the system spec but not everyone ruled out 8N. 8N isn't confirmed either really now, we just have a deeper analysis ruling out 5nm based nodes but it could also be another process revision of 10nm. Like the Korean business leak last year that named a custom process previously unheard of: 7LPH. You are right, there is good analysis there too and I don't want to be unfair by dismissing it. It is crazy how people saying "it is impossible" about a console not even out and games not even released is the default reasonable position lol. I'm happy to just wait and see what happens. Takes nothing to not be overly optimistic or pessimistic. The amount of times people on Era have been wrong about Switch 2 in the last 4 weeks tells me that time is a much better judge of reality than forum posts. Performance in line with the Apple A12 from a billion years ago rules out games that have high CPU needs. It's like saying that I can live without oxygen - sometimes the actual facts have implications. Someone taking the CPU apart to get the actual specs of it is not a forum post. Generally sure but the Famiboards hardware thread is where basically every credible leak about the system originated. Even DF credits them. Either way, docked or undocked, the system is turning out more performant than expected on 8N. Famiboards literally crucified anyone that claimed it could be 8nm. They got some things right but failed miserably on others and acted so weird about it. I remember having a conversation with one in another topic where some mystery professionals claimed I was wrong and I was uneducated on the matter, even though I literally have a masters in nanotechnology/Electronics. Apologies for the SUPER late reply (holy shit, this thread is still going), but my claim is predicated on... every Nintendo system's 3P sales since probably the SNES. I understand that you think (and I ardently agree! It was the whole reason for me replying about the fact that) the system is capable, but my argument from the start - with a bizarre accusation of console warring when I made it plain that the PS4 comparison was apt - has been that a look at the top... 20? 30? best sellers? on Switch are almost nothing but Nintendo games. There are plenty of Switch games, but they don't sell like Nintendo games. I think someone posted a chart that included a very cute set of games, but they are not the ones you find on other platforms' sales charts (other than Minecraft, maybe? I don't think even that's up there anymore). I'm honestly confused that this thread is still going, because basic evidence makes my original statement just as true as it was the first time: a portable PS4 is insane given what that system put out. I fully expect it to be capable of the kind of fidelity of a Horizon or Last of Us Part II. But I don't expect it to produce many non-MonHun-level hits for big publishers. I think it will get some really technically impressive ports from devs that care, but I don't think they'll match the sales of Nintendo games, for which you buy a Nintendo system. Nintendo fans are getting so impossibly fucked up over a comparison to a system that, to this day, in 2025, more than A DECADE AFTER IT WAS RELEASED, still looks modern. And you'll be holding that in your hands in like a month. You'll just be playing mostly Nintendo games on it in two years because that's all anyone's gonna buy outside of eShop indie pick-ups. I agree that there is no reason to be upset by comparisons to the PS4, especially for a handheld system. Not only because the PS4 was home to many great-looking games but also because I firmly believe that the Switch 2 will get many current-gen ports. Even the Steam Deck can play most of this year's AAA, there's no reason Nintendo's console won't be able to. I understand your argument about Nintendo's third-party situation but I think the Switch has changed Nintendo 's audience demographics. A lot more core gamers jumped on board and they will want to buy core games from third parties. Famiboards literally crucified anyone that claimed it could be 8nm. They got some things right but failed miserably on others and acted so weird about it. I remember having a conversation with one in another topic where some mystery professionals claimed I was wrong and I was uneducated on the matter, even though I literally have a masters in nanotechnology/Electronics. That wasn't my experience there and I did see people arguing for or for the possibility for 8nm. Sorry you had such a negative run in. Performance in line with the Apple A12 from a billion years ago rules out games that have high CPU needs. It's like saying that I can live without oxygen - sometimes the actual facts have implications. Someone taking the CPU apart to get the actual specs of it is not a forum post. There's low hanging fruit like reducing npcs and running animations at half framerate from a distance. There's higher hanging fruit like moving cpu code to the gpu as they did with the Witcher 3 switch 1 version. You can't say what's definitely not possible, unless you are prepared to eat crow. Since the base PS5 went down to 1080p in performance mode (afaik), and the Switch 2 is estimated to be around 1/4th the graphical power of that system, could 512p DLSS to 720-1080p with reasonable optimizations be a possible option? Doesn't seem like we are gonna dip below 540p territory like the older platform did quite yet or as a default. Game is gonna be is 20 to low 30s without work. Hopefully they just aim to make it more stable than peaking cause bandwidth cuts gotta made somewhere else first. I see devs squeezing fx and keeping res low to make it slightly easier than jut aiming for slight above 720p to mid 800s for more modern games. There's low hanging fruit like reducing npcs and running animations at half framerate from a distance. There's higher hanging fruit like moving cpu code to the gpu as they did with the Witcher 3 switch 1 version. You can't say what's definitely not possible, unless you are prepared to eat crow. Witcher 3 is a weird edge case where the game is highly adaptive. The scale of the difference rules out high CPU-need games, much like it did for the Switch 1. The Switch 2 will be a great target for PS4 titles. Other things are harder. We can rule out games we know have extreme CPU needs on a game by game basis. Witcher 3 is a weird edge case where the game is highly adaptive. The scale of the difference rules out high CPU-need games, much like it did for the Switch 1. The Switch 2 will be a great target for PS4 titles. Other things are harder. We can rule out games we know have extreme CPU needs on a game by game basis. Do you have any examples of games you would absolutely rule out? Do we know yet how much power wattage Switch 2 uses? You're right, undocked it's paper spec 1.7TF is slightly outperforming the 1.7TF PS4 in simulated benchmarks. They were generally higher than people were expecting GPU side though. And in actual games shown so far, docked is performing in the PS4 ballpark. "Simulated benchmarks" being a benchmark that isn't a game. Witcher 3 is a weird edge case where the game is highly adaptive. The scale of the difference rules out high CPU-need games, much like it did for the Switch 1. The Switch 2 will be a great target for PS4 titles. Other things are harder. We can rule out games we know have extreme CPU needs on a game by game basis. Aside from GTA, which games would that be? Hu? Why is this thread so big? Keep in mind you are comparing end of the gen highly optimised ps4 games, to work in progress demos from a console that hasn't released. Those comparisons are going to be outdated real quick I reckon. Indeed, in fact I wouldn't be surprised if the same titles would perform higher at launch. But taking a synthetic benchmark instead of actual games seems wrong. People feel compelled to argue against raw specs and also Digital Foundry. It's not enough that there are tons and tons of games from the PS4 gen/less demanding current gen games that can be ported to Switch 2 as well as Nintendo exclusives - everything has to be perfect all the time. People feel compelled to argue against raw specs and also Digital Foundry. It's not enough that there are tons and tons of games from the PS4 gen/less demanding current gen games that can be ported to Switch 2 as well as Nintendo exclusives - everything has to be perfect all the time. That is an over simplification of what we are seeing/discussing and takes jabs at people's opinions that differ from your own and DF. Unless you have a kit in your hands and can benchmark you are speculating like the rest of us. What we are seeing are examples of games that could not run on PS4 or performed less efficiently than what we are seeing in Switch 2. For the sake of argument, if Xbox Series S/X and PS5 did NOT exist, from a console perspective would you prefer to play games on PS4 or Switch 2 for the optimal experience? That is an over simplification of what we are seeing/discussing and takes jabs at people's opinions that differ from your own and DF. Unless you have a kit in your hands and can benchmark you are speculating like the rest of us. What we are seeing are examples of games that could not run on PS4 or performed less efficiently than what we are seeing in Switch 2. For the sake of argument, if Xbox Series S/X and PS5 did NOT exist, from a console perspective would you prefer to play games on PS4 or Switch 2 for the optimal experience? I can look at numbers, obtained by analyzing the physical SOC - and draw reasonable conclusions. I do not need a dev kit for that. The CPU numbers are the numbers. The GPU numbers are the numbers. There is no magic way around that. If the game has CPU needs and the system can't reach those needs.....that's that. DF did the same thing - with inside information, rather than what we all can do now with the public information - and reached the same results. The 'other side' of the audience is forum posters who do not appear to be technically knowledgable. I would prefer to play games that are only on PS4 and Switch on the Switch 2, as it has more modern features such as DLSS. But if the game is more demanding, I'd want to play it on something that can handle it. The Switch 2 is - in many ways - more powerful than the PS4 but nothing even close to the Series S. It's kind of a PS4+. It is behind the Steam Deck in certain metrics. It's a weird system. I would prefer to play games that are only on PS4 and Switch on the Switch 2, as it has more modern features such as DLSS. But if the game is more demanding, I'd want to play it on something that can handle it. The Switch 2 is - in many ways - more powerful than the PS4 but nothing even close to the Series S. It's kind of a PS4+. It is behind the Steam Deck in certain metrics. It's a weird system. Thats your preferences and I respect that. Millions have demonstated with their wallets that they are willing to take severe compromises if it gives them a portable version of the game. A sizeable market for that exists. Considering what was achieved on Switch, imho it's folly to make statements about X game being absolutely impossible on S2. Games can scale. In one important metric S2 is comparable or better than RDNA2 and thats gpu features. And that goes a long way. Thats your preferences and I respect that. Millions have demonstated with their wallets that they are willing to take severe compromises if it gives them a portable version of the game. A sizeable market for that exists. "Considering what was achieved on Switch, imho it's folly to make statements about X game being absolutely impossible on S2. Games can scale. In one important metric S2 is comparable or better than RDNA2 and thats gpu features. And that goes a long way. Yeah, but the problem here is that the compromises that people are willing to tolerate do not exist for games that have more demanding CPU needs - and not because it can't be done in a handheld. The CPU performance is far behind the Steam Deck. Nintendo made choices that will prevent the Switch from being as performant as it could be in that form factor and those choices will have consequences as we get further into this generation. Much like the Switch 1, as titles that have higher needs come out - those titles won't get ports. "Considering what was achieved on Switch, imho it's folly to make statements about X game being absolutely impossible on S2. Games can scale." No, it's just math and numbers. We have the numbers and they reveal a lot. The Switch ultimately missed an absolutely massive amount of PS4/XBO titles....because it didn't have the power to run them. The ones it did get were either highly adaptive titles or titles with minimal needs in the first place. In one important metric S2 is comparable or better than RDNA2 and thats gpu features. And that goes a long way. The GPU features you are speaking about do not matter if you don't have the power to actually use them. It just means you don't have to dramatically alter a game to remove effects that were ray traced in the other versions - you just run the effects at extremely low settings and no one can even tell they are there. But that only matters if the game's CPU/GPU needs outside of those features are within what can fit on the Switch 2. The exception to this is DLSS, which helps with titles that need to run at lower resolutions due to GPU limits. Upscaling can help produce a better image. This does not help at all with the CPU problem, though. For the love of god, please. You are arguing against math. You are pretending that the Switch 1 got FF7 Remake/Call of Duty/RDR 2/2077/PUBG/Monster Hunter World - all demanding games that aren't so scalable that they can fit on essentially an Xbox 360 - when in reality it got Witcher 3 (which is extremely scalable - you can see this in the PC version) and an incredibly pared down version of FIFA - the previous generation version with roster updates. Oh, and Borderlands I guess - a game that was specifically made to run on low end PC laptops. Please, please be realistic. There is no witchcraft here. You either have the performance or you don't. Yes, it is good to go from a system that struggled to run Disco Elysium to something that can run everything that shipped on PS4. That's great. But let's not pretend that magic can happen and you'll get or a good version of