

---

Subject: Re: Some observations from ploop testing  
Posted by [jjs - mainphrame](#) on Sun, 25 Mar 2012 07:16:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks for the update and the supplementary information!

Joe

On Sat, Mar 24, 2012 at 11:22 PM, Kirill Korotaev <[dev@parallels.com](mailto:dev@parallels.com)> wrote:

> 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> 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> 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>

>>

> <ATT00001.c>

>

>

---