## Subject: Re: [PATCH 11/33] task containersv11 make cpusets a client of containers Posted by Paul Menage on Thu, 04 Oct 2007 15:16:34 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On 10/4/07, Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> wrote:
> Paul M.
>
> This snippet from the memory allocation hot path worries me a bit.
> Once per memory page allocation, we go through here, needing to peak inside
> the current tasks cpuset to see if it has changed (it's 'mems' generation'
> value doesn't match the last seen value we have stashed in the task struct.)
>
> @ @ -653,20 +379,19 @ @ void cpuset_update_task_memory_state(voi
      struct task_struct *tsk = current;
>
>
      struct cpuset *cs;
>
      if (tsk->cpuset == &top_cpuset) {
       if (task cs(tsk) == &top cpuset) {
> +
           /* Don't need rcu for top cpuset. It's never freed. */
>
           my_cpusets_mem_gen = top_cpuset.mems_generation;
>
      } else {
>
           rcu read lock():
           cs = rcu dereference(tsk->cpuset);
           my_cpusets_mem_gen = cs->mems_generation;
            my_cpusets_mem_gen = task_cs(current)->mems_generation;
           rcu_read_unlock();
>
      }
>
>
> With this new cgroup code, the task_cs macro was added, -twice-,
> which deals with the fact that what used to be a single pointer
> in the task struct directly to the tasks cpuset is now roughly
> two more dereferences and an indexing away:
```

It's two constant-indexed dereferences \*in total\*, compared to a single constant-indexed dereference in the pre-cgroup case.

The cpuset pointer is found at task->cgroups->subsys[cpuset\_subsys\_id], where cpuset\_subsys\_id is a compile-time constant.

> At a minimum, could you change that last added line to use 'tsk' > instead of 'current'? This should save one instruction, as 'tsk' > will likely already be in a register.

Sounds reasonable.

>

- > I wonder if we can save any cache line hits on this, or if there is
- > someway to measure whether or not this has noticeable performance
- > impact.

I didn't notice any performance hit on a pure allocate/free memory benchmark relative to non-cgroup cpusets. (There was a small performance hit relative to not using cpusets at all, but that was to be expected).

Paul

\_\_\_\_\_

Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers