
Subject: Re: [Q] missing unused dentry in prune_dcache()?

Posted by [vaverin](#) on Wed, 25 Oct 2006 13:58:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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
