
Subject: Re: pid namespace .text overhead

Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Tue, 11 Sep 2007 07:13:38 GMT

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

sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

> Cedric Le Goater [clg@fr.ibm.com] wrote:

> | FYI,

> |

> | I just did a compile test on a 2.6.23-rc4-mm1 kernel with and without

> | the following patches on a x86_64 defconfig (I also had to remove

> | CONFIG_IPV6 for some compile reason) :

>

> Thats a good point.

>

> We have been a bit liberal with "inline" given that lot of the code was

> going to affect the "fast-path" clone().

are are some figures :

with without

text	data		text	data		filename
1186	4		1099	4		kernel/capability.o
10390	0		9941	0		kernel/exit.o
10611	140		10434	140		kernel/fork.o
10765	72		10518	72		kernel/futex.o
957	56		939	56		kernel/nsproxy.o
3446	2292		2350	2228		kernel/pid.o
13930	45		13641	45		kernel/signal.o
10177	544		9819	544		kernel/sys.o
5083	56		4809	56		fs/proc/array.o
17097	184		16748	184		fs/proc/base.o
51471	1532		50474	1532		fs/proc/proc.o

> Should we shoot for a time/space trade-off or can we make some inlines

> conditional (i.e inline when not configured for say embedded linux) ?

I'm sure the embedded guys will appreciate :)

Thanks !

C.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
