Subject: Re: [PATCH RFC] sched: boost throttled entities on wakeups
Posted by Peter Zijlstra on Fri, 19 Oct 2012 14:24:50 GMT

On Thu, 2012-10-18 at 11:32 +0400, Vladimir Davydov wrote:
>
> 1) Do you agree that the problem exists and should be sorted out?

This is two questions.. yes it exists, I'm absolutely sure I pointed it
out as soon as people even started talking about this nonsense (bw
cruft).

Should it be sorted, dunno, in general !PREEMPT_RT is very susceptible
to all this and in general we don't fix it.

> 2) If so, does the general approach proposed (unthrottling on wakeups) suits
> you? Why or why not?

its a quick hack similar to existing hacks done for rt, preferably we'd
do smarter things though.

> 3) If you think that the approach proposed is sane, what you dislike about the
> patch?

its not inlined, its got coding style issues, but worst of all, you
added yet another callback from the schedule() path and did it wrong ;-)

Also, it adds even more bw cruft overhead to regular scheduling paths,
we took some pains to limit that when we introduced the fail^Wfeature.