
Subject: Re: [patch 2/6] [Network namespace] Network device sharing by view
Posted by [Alexey Kuznetsov](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 16:49:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, Jun 27, 2006 at 06:02:42PM +0200, Herbert Poetzl wrote:

- > - loopback traffic inside a guest is insignificantly
- > slower than on a normal system
- >
- > - loopback traffic on the host is insignificantly
- > slower than on a normal system
- >
- > - inter guest traffic is faster than on-wire traffic,
- > and should be withing a small tolerance of the
- > loopback case (as it really isn't different)

I do not follow what are you people arguing about?

Intra-guest, guest-guest and host-guest paths have `_no_` differences from host-host loopback. Only the device is different:

- * virtual loopback for intra-guest
- * virtual interface for guest-guest and host-guest

But the work is exactly the same, only the place where packets looped back is different. How could this be issue to break a lance over? :-)

Alexey

PS. The only thing, which I can imagine is "optimized" out `ip_route_input()` in the case of loopback. But this optimization was an obvious design mistake (mine, sorry) and apparently will die together with removal of current deficiencies of routing cache. Actually, it is one of deficiencies.
