Subject: Re: [PATCH, v3 2/2] cgroups: introduce timer slack subsystem Posted by Kirill A. Shutsemov on Mon, 07 Feb 2011 09:48:51 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Sat, Feb 05, 2011 at 06:49:51PM -0800, Matt Helsley wrote:
> On Thu, Feb 03, 2011 at 11:41:38AM +0200, Kirill A. Shutemov wrote:
>> On Wed, Feb 02, 2011 at 09:46:16PM -0800, Matt Helsley wrote:
> > On Wed, Feb 02, 2011 at 10:47:36PM +0200, Kirill A. Shutsemov wrote:
>>> From: Kirill A. Shutemov <kirill@shutemov.name>
> <snip>
>>> diff --git a/kernel/cgroup_timer_slack.c b/kernel/cgroup_timer_slack.c
>>> new file mode 100644
>>> index 0000000..a343a50
> > > --- /dev/null
>>> +++ b/kernel/cgroup timer slack.c
> <snip>
>>> +static int tslack write set slack ns(struct cgroup *cgroup, struct cftype *cft,
>>>+ u64 val
>>>+{
>>> + struct timer_slack_cgroup *tslack_cgroup;
>>> + struct cgroup_iter it;
>>> + struct task struct *task;
>>>+
>>> + tslack cgroup = cgroup to tslack cgroup(cgroup);
>>> + if (!val || val < tslack cgroup->min slack ns ||
>>> Why is a val of 0 disallowed? I know having slack is good, but for
>> an administrator or tool that doesn't care about number of wakeups
>>> and cares more about wringing out performance a slack of
>>> 0 seems acceptable. Is this just here to be consistent with the
>> values passed in via prctl?
>> Yes, it's to consistent with the prctl(). I don't think that it's good
> > idea to allow to set timer slack outside of range prctl() allows. It may
> > lead to interface abuse.
> Hmm, I was just thinking that 0 timer slack might be useful. But I
> suppose you could just as easily set it to 1 and nobody would notice.
```

I've rechecked once again. it lookes cleaner to allow 0 as timer slack value.

I allowed it in version 4 of the patchset.

Kirill A. Shutemov

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