
Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/4] net: Dynamically allocate the per cpu counters for the loopback device.

Posted by [davem](#) on Thu, 27 Sep 2007 20:56:16 GMT

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

From: ebiederm@xmission.com (Eric W. Biederman)

Date: Thu, 27 Sep 2007 14:44:37 -0600

> David Miller <davem@davemloft.net> writes:

>

> > From: ebiederm@xmission.com (Eric W. Biederman)

> > Date: Thu, 27 Sep 2007 01:48:00 -0600

> >

> >> I'm not doing get_cpu/put_cpu so does the comment make sense

> >> in relationship to per_cpu_ptr?

> >

> > It is possible. But someone would need to go check for

> > sure.

>

> Verified.

>

> hard_start_xmit is called inside of a

> rcu_read_lock_bh(),rcu_read_unlock_bh() pair. Which means

> the code will only run on one cpu.

>

> Therefore we do not need get_cpu/put_cpu.

>

> In addition per_cpu_ptr is valid. As it is just a lookup

> into a NR_CPUS sized array by smp_processor_id() to return

> the address of the specific cpu.

>

> The only difference between per_cpu_ptr and __get_cpu_var()

> are the implementation details between statically allocated

> and dynamically allocated per cpu state.

>

> So the comment is still valid, and still interesting it just

> should say per_cpu_ptr instead of __get_cpu_var.

>

> Signed-off-by: "Eric W. Biederman" <ebiederm@xmission.com>

I've already removed the comment, so you'll have to give me a patch that adds it back with the new content :-)

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

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