Subject: Re: [Q] missing unused dentry in prune_dcache()?
Posted by vaverin on Wed, 25 Oct 2006 13:58:40 GMT

David Howells wrote:
> Vasily Averin <vvs@sw.ru> wrote:
>> The patch adds this dentry into tail of the dentry_unused list.
>
> I think that's reasonable. I wonder if we can avoid removing it from the list
> in the first place, but I suspect it's less optimal.

Could you please explain this place in details, I do not understand why tail of
the list is better than head.
Also I do not understand why we should go to out in this case. Why we cannot use
next dentry in the list instead?

> Acked-By: David Howells <dhowells@redhat.com>

Thank you,
 Vasily Averin