Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/7] event: don't divide events if it has field period
Posted by avagin on Thu, 17 Nov 2011 08:22:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello Peter,

> On 11/09/2011 03:55 PM, Peter Zijlstra wrote:
>>
>> On Mon, 2011-11-07 at 15:54 +0300, Andrew Vagin wrote:
>>>
>>> This patch solves the following problem:
>>>
>>> Now some samples may be lost due to throttling. The number of samples is
>>> restricted by sysctl_perf_event_sample_rate/HZ. A trace event is
>>> divided on some samples according to event's period. I don't sure, that
>>> we should generate more than one sample on each trace event. I think the
>>> better way to use SAMPLE_PERIOD.
>>
>> It would be yes, but this code predates that, also it needs to work even
>> if the user doesn't provide SAMPLE_PERIOD.

I have not understood exactly what I should do now.
I'm going to send the third version of this patches. New version
contains only a small fix according with the comment for path 4/7.
In new version I am not going to fix the problem about which we
discussed early. I have some reasons for it:

* It's another task. My decision is more effective for my task and I
believe that exists many cases where my decision may be suitable. I
want to say, that it may be in kernel, event if the problem would not
exist at all.
* __perf_count() has been broken for a long time and nobody reports
this problem, so we can say, that the problem isn't urgent.
* Only few events sched:sched_stat_* are affected by this problem.
* I am not sure, that we should to solve this problem. The "problem"
may be not a problem at all. We have ability to customize
sample_period and we have events about that some events were
throttled.

If you have any objection, send them to me.

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/7] event: don't divide events if it has field period
Posted by Peter Zijlstra on Thu, 17 Nov 2011 08:45:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, 2011-11-17 at 11:22 +0300, Andrew Wagin wrote:
> Hello Peter,
>

> > On 11/09/2011 03:55 PM, Peter Zijlstra wrote:
> >>
> >> On Mon, 2011-11-07 at 15:54 +0300, Andrew Vagin wrote:
> >>>
> >>> This patch solves the following problem:
> >>>
> >>> Now some samples may be lost due to throttling. The number of samples is
> >>> restricted by sysctl_perf_event_sample_rate/HZ. A trace event is
> >>> divided on some samples according to event's period. I don't sure, that
> >>> we should generate more than one sample on each trace event. I think the
> >>> better way to use SAMPLE_PERIOD.
> >>
> >> It would be yes, but this code predates that, also it needs to work even
> >> if the user doesn't provide SAMPLE_PERIOD.
>
> I have not understood exactly what I should do now.
> I'm going to send the third version of this patches. New version
> contains only a small fix according with the comment for path 4/7.
> In new version I am not going to fix the problem about which we
> discussed early. I have some reasons for it:

I already merged your previous version, it can be found in tip.
