
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 1/7] Resource counters
Posted by [xemul](#) on Wed, 14 Mar 2007 07:12:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Srivatsa Vaddagiri wrote:

> On Tue, Mar 13, 2007 at 06:41:05PM +0300, Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>>> right, but atomic ops have much less impact on most

>>> architectures than locks :)

>> Right. But `atomic_add_unless()` is slower as it is

>> essentially a loop. See my previous letter in this sub-thread.

>

> If I am not mistaken, you shouldn't loop in normal cases, which means

> it boils down to a `atomic_read()` + `atomic_cmpxch()`

>

>

So does the lock - in a normal case (when it's not heavily contented) it will boil down to `atomic_dec_and_test()`.

Nevertheless, making charge like in this patchset requires two atomic ops with `atomic_xxx` and only one with `spin_lock()`.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.osdl.org

<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
