

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] cfq: async queue allocation per priority

Posted by [Jens Axboe](#) on Thu, 19 Jul 2007 17:30:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, Jul 19 2007, Vasily Tarasov wrote:

> On Wed, 2007-07-18 at 20:51 +0200, Jens Axboe wrote:

> > On Wed, Jul 18 2007, Vasily Tarasov wrote:

> > > Jens, I think the last patch, that makes queues allocation per priority,

> > > has a problem.

> > >

> > > If we have two processes with different `ioprio_class`, but the same

> > > `ioprio_data`, their async requests will fall into the same queue. I guess

> > > such behavior is not expected, because it's not right to put real-time

> > > requests and best-effort requests in the same queue.

> > >

> > > The attached patch fixes the problem by introducing additional `*cfqq`

> > > fields on `cfqd`, pointing to per-(class,priority) async queues.

> >

> > Ugh yes. I'm pretty tempted just to reinstate the `cfqq` hash again, it

> > used to be a clean up but now the it's not stacking up so well.

> >

>

> Hello, Jens,

>

> From my humble point of view `cfqq` hash has two problems:

>

> 1. It is excess data structure. All needed information can be obtained

> from other structures easily, so the presence of hash is a bit

> strange... I mean that it's aim is not obvious :)

>

> 2. Hash hides from a developer a pretty important concept of CFQ: there

> are shared between processes per-priority async queues. I think the code

> is the best documentation, so the explicit async `cfqq` pointers at `cfqd`

> structure reveal this concept greatly.

>

> Summary:

>

> IMHO the hash revival is not very good way. However, this is of course

> fully in your competence to choose the right decision! ;)

Yeah, it's probably still better off without the hash. I'll play with it  
a bit and see what comes of it.

--

Jens Axboe

---