
Subject: Re: nptl perf bench and profiling with pidns patchsets
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 21:19:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cedric Le Goater wrote:

> Kirill Korotaev wrote:

>>> the results were also very reproducible but the profiling was too noisy.

>>> we also changed the kernel. the previous pidns patchset was on a 2.6.21-mm2

>>> and we ported it on a 2.6.22-rc1-mm1.

>> If reproducible, then were they the same as Pavel posted?

hmm, i don't think I have answered that question clearly.

No, i didn't get the same results (with a working TSC), even with unixbench, and that's why I switched to profiling with nptl perf. Because the difference between these patchsets is so little, I'm hoping that there might be one them which could be improved to make a real difference.

Right now, i'm getting better results with suka's by a magnitude of 1 or 2%, with unixbench and with nptl perf. but that does not mean anything because standard deviation is high and there might be scenarii where pavel's patchset is behaving better much better.

So i'll continue studying these pathsets, and run some more tests under an unshared pid namespace. If you have any suggestion for improvements, please propose. Pavel, could I try your multilevel patchset ?

pavel's proposal is very similar to what we've started talking about in 2005 and it fits our requirements. I'm really in favor of finishing this pid namespace :)

thanks,

C.

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
