
Subject: Re: [PATCH 7/8] Do not recompute msgmni anymore if explicitly set by user

Posted by [Nadia Derby](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2008 11:47:57 GMT

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

Andrew Morton wrote:

> On Tue, 12 Feb 2008 16:15:00 +0100

> Nadia Derby <Nadia.Derbey@bull.net> wrote:

>

>

>>Andrew Morton wrote:

>>

>>>On Tue, 12 Feb 2008 10:32:31 +0100 Nadia Derby <Nadia.Derbey@bull.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>>it builds fine, modulo some changes in ipv4 and ipv6 (see attached patch

>>>>- didn't find it in the hot fixes).

>>>

>>>

>>>OK, thanks for checking. Did you confirm that we don't have unneeded code

>>>in vmlinux when CONFIG_PROCFS=n? I guess before-and-after comparison of

>>>the size(1) output would tell us.

>>>

>>>Those networking build problems appear to have already been fixed.

>>>

>>>In future, please quote the compiler error output in the changelog when

>>>sending build fixes or warning fixes, thanks.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>>BEFORE:

>>

>>|kernel@akt\$ size vmlinux

>> text data bss dec hex filename

>>4318525 454484 462848 5235857 4fe491 vmlinux

>>

>>

>>AFTER:

>>

>>|kernel@akt\$ size vmlinux

>> text data bss dec hex filename

>>4323161 454484 462848 5240493 4ff6ad vmlinux

>>

>>which makes it +4636 = +0.11%

>>

>>I've got the details for */built-in.o if needed.

>>

>

>

> That seems to be a lot of increase. Are you sure you had CONFIG_PROCFS=n
> in both cases? If so, the patch must have added a lot of code which will
> never be executed?

>

>

>

Well, the patches that are impacted by procfs being configured or not
are #7 and #8. While the sizes I've sent you are before all patches
applied vs after all patches applied :-)

So here are the "interesting sizes" - all with CONFIG_PROC_FS unset:

before patch 7:

	text	data	bss	dec	hex	filename
	4318757	454484	462848	5236089	4fe579	vmlinux

before patch 8:

	text	data	bss	dec	hex	filename	
	4318853	454484	462848	5236185	4fe5d9	vmlinux	+96

after patch 8:

	4319055	454484	462848	5236387	4fe6a3	vmlinux	+202
--	---------	--------	--------	---------	--------	---------	------

The higher difference after patch 8 is because I'm adding the new
interface blocking_notifier_chain_cond_register() even if CONFIG_PROC_FS
is not defined. This is to cover the case where msgmni is set through
the sysctl() syscall (CONFIG_SYSCTL_SYSCALL).

Regards,
Nadia

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