
Subject: Re: Some observations from ploop testing
Posted by [Kirill Korotaev](#) on Sun, 25 Mar 2012 06:22:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Exactly. It's fixed in next kernel version. Sorry for that.

Btw, when comparing performance be aware that disk performance depends a lot on placement.
Disk beginning is typically around 2x faster.

Sent from my iPhonespam SPAMSPAM

On 25.03.2012, at 0:21, "jjs - mainphrame"
<jjs@mainphrame.com<mailto:jjs@mainphrame.com>> wrote:

I'm running slabtop every 30 seconds during a dbench run and the thing that is growing the fastest
and taking the lion's share is biovec-256 - you can see it growing at 30 second intervals.

	OBJS	ACTIVE	USE	OBJ SIZE	SLABS	OBJ/SLAB	CACHE SIZE	NAME
	88	58	65%	3.00K	44	2	352K	biovec-2
134	96	71%	3.00K	67	2	536K	biovec-2	
152	100	65%	3.00K	76	2	608K	biovec-2	
112	74	66%	3.00K	56	2	448K	biovec-2	
140	94	67%	3.00K	70	2	560K	biovec-2	
74	56	75%	3.00K	37	2	296K	biovec-2	
144	102	70%	3.00K	72	2	576K	biovec-2	
114	82	71%	3.00K	57	2	456K	biovec-2	
154	116	75%	3.00K	77	2	616K	biovec-2	
80	60	75%	3.00K	40	2	320K	biovec-2	
164	122	74%	3.00K	82	2	656K	biovec-2	
152	114	75%	3.00K	76	2	608K	biovec-2	
70	46	65%	3.00K	35	2	280K	biovec-2	
1004	1004	100%	3.00K	502	2	4016K	biovec-2	
1952	1952	100%	3.00K	976	2	7808K	biovec-2	
2946	2946	100%	3.00K	1473	2	11784K	biovec-2	
3876	3876	100%	3.00K	1938	2	15504K	biovec-2	
4858	4858	100%	3.00K	2429	2	19432K	biovec-2	
5844	5844	100%	3.00K	2922	2	23376K	biovec-2	
6782	6782	100%	3.00K	3391	2	27128K	biovec-2	
7766	7766	100%	3.00K	3883	2	31064K	biovec-2	
8774	8774	100%	3.00K	4387	2	35096K	biovec-2	
9774	9774	100%	3.00K	4887	2	39096K	biovec-2	
10750	10750	100%	3.00K	5375	2	43000K	biovec-2	
11696	11696	100%	3.00K	5848	2	46784K	biovec-2	
12700	12700	100%	3.00K	6350	2	50800K	biovec-2	
13676	13676	100%	3.00K	6838	2	54704K	biovec-2	
14644	14644	100%	3.00K	7322	2	58576K	biovec-2	
15620	15620	100%	3.00K	7810	2	62480K	biovec-2	
16568	16568	100%	3.00K	8284	2	66272K	biovec-2	

17582	17582	100%	3.00K	8791	2	70328K biovec-2
18562	18562	100%	3.00K	9281	2	74248K biovec-2
19558	19558	100%	3.00K	9779	2	78232K biovec-2
20500	20500	100%	3.00K	10250	2	82000K biovec-2
21424	21424	100%	3.00K	10712	2	85696K biovec-2
22414	22414	100%	3.00K	11207	2	89656K biovec-2
23404	23404	100%	3.00K	11702	2	93616K biovec-2
25252	25252	100%	3.00K	12626	2	101008K biovec-2
27192	27192	100%	3.00K	13596	2	108768K biovec-2
29172	29172	100%	3.00K	14586	2	116688K biovec-2
31112	31112	100%	3.00K	15556	2	124448K biovec-2
33006	33006	100%	3.00K	16503	2	132024K biovec-2
34998	34926	99%	3.00K	17499	2	139992K biovec-2
36820	36820	100%	3.00K	18410	2	147280K biovec-2
38750	38750	100%	3.00K	19375	2	155000K biovec-2
40480	40480	100%	3.00K	20240	2	161920K biovec-2
42362	42362	100%	3.00K	21181	2	169448K biovec-2
44264	44264	100%	3.00K	22132	2	177056K biovec-2
46182	46182	100%	3.00K	23091	2	184728K biovec-2
48058	48058	100%	3.00K	24029	2	192232K biovec-2
49982	49974	99%	3.00K	24991	2	199928K biovec-2
51894	51894	100%	3.00K	25947	2	207576K biovec-2
53828	53808	99%	3.00K	26914	2	215312K biovec-2
55596	55596	100%	3.00K	27798	2	222384K biovec-2
57484	57484	100%	3.00K	28742	2	229936K biovec-2
59352	59352	100%	3.00K	29676	2	237408K biovec-2
61304	61286	99%	3.00K	30652	2	245216K biovec-2

Joe

On Sat, Mar 24, 2012 at 11:40 AM, Kirill Korotaev

<dev@parallels.com<mailto:dev@parallels.com>> wrote:

Can you please report slabtop output? We've just fixed obe memory leak. Thanks!

Sent from my iPhonespam SPAMSPAM

On 24.03.2012, at 21:57, "jjs - mainphrame"

<jjs@mainphrame.com<mailto:jjs@mainphrame.com>> wrote:

> I've been creating simfs and ploop based containers and exercising them in different ways. While the ploop-based containers are basically working, in my testing a ploop-based CT seems to require more resources than an equivalent simfs-based CT. On my modest 32 bit test rig with 1 GB RAM, I've been running dbench on simfs based CTs and looking at performance with new kernel versions. But when running dbench tests on a ploop based CT with the same resources, it has not been able to finish because the machine runs out of resources, performance slows to a crawl and even host processes are killed off.

>

> I'll try to get some more memory for this machine for further testing.

>
> Regards,
>
> Joe
> <ATT00001.c>

Users mailing list
Users@openvz.org<mailto:Users@openvz.org>
<https://openvz.org/mailman/listinfo/users>

<ATT00001.c>
