

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] block: blk\_max\_pfn is sometimes wrong  
Posted by [Jens Axboe](#) on Fri, 09 Feb 2007 17:28:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, Feb 08 2007, Vasily Tarasov wrote:

> There is a small problem in handling page bounce.  
>  
> At the moment blk\_max\_pfn equals max\_pfn, which is in fact  
> not maximum possible \_number\_ of a page frame, but the \_amount\_  
> of page frames. For example for the 32bit x86 node with 4Gb RAM,  
> max\_pfn = 0x100000, but not 0xFFFF.  
>  
> request\_queue structure has a member q->bounce\_pfn and queue needs  
> bounce pages for the pages \_above\_ this limit. This routine is handled  
> by blk\_queue\_bounce(), where the following check is produced:  
>  
> if (q->bounce\_pfn >= blk\_max\_pfn)  
> return;  
>  
> Assume, that a driver has set q->bounce\_pfn to 0xFFFF, but  
> blk\_max\_pfn equals 0x10000. In such situation the check above  
> fails and for each bio we always fall down for iterating over  
> pages tied to the bio.  
>  
> I want to notice, that for quite a big range of device drivers  
> (ide, md, ...) such problem doesn't happen because they use  
> BLK\_BOUNCE\_ANY for bounce\_pfn. BLK\_BOUNCE\_ANY is defined as  
> blk\_max\_pfn << PAGE\_SHIFT, and then the check above doesn't fail.  
> But for other drivers, which obtain required value from drivers,  
> it fails. For example sata\_nv uses ATA\_DMA\_MASK or dev->dma\_mask.  
>  
> I propose to use (max\_pfn - 1) for blk\_max\_pfn. And the  
> same for blk\_max\_low\_pfn. The patch also cleanses some checks  
> related with bounce\_pfn.  
>  
> Signed-off-by: Vasily Tarasov <vtaras@openvz.org>

I will add that this is also a performance optimization, as it was initially discovered by Vasily because he saw bounces issues with blktrace. The blktrace notify was done early when we iterated the bio segments to check for bounces, no bounces were actually issued (this problem was fixed for 2.6.20 by moving the notify in mm/bounce.c to when we actually bounce). So it does cause needless bio segment iterations on some setups, because of this one-off.

Acked-by: Jens Axboe <jens.axboe@oracle.com>

--

