Subject: Re: Some observations from ploop testing
Posted by jjs - mainphrame on Sun, 25 Mar 2012 07:16:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks for the update and the supplementary information!

Joe

On Sat, Mar 24, 2012 at 11:22 PM, Kirill Korotaev <dev@parallels.com> wrote:

> Exactly. It's fixed in next kernel version. Sorry for that.
>
> Btw, when comparing performance be aware that disk performance depends a
> lot on placement. Disk beginning is typically around 2x faster.
>
> Sent from my iPhonespam SPAMSPAM
>
> On 25.03.2012, at 0:21, "jjs - mainphrame" <jjs@mainphrame.com> wrote:
>
> I'm running slabtop every 30 seconds during a dbench run and the thing
> that is growing the fastest and taking the lion's share is biovec-256 - you
> can see it growing at 30 second intervals.
>
> OBJS ACTIVE USE OBJ SIZE SLABS OBJ/SLAB CACHE SIZE NAME
> 88 58 65% 3.00K 44 2 352K biovec-2
> 134 96 71% 3.00K 67 2 536K biovec-2
> 152 100 65% 3.00K 76 2 608K biovec-2
> 112 74 66% 3.00K 56 2 448K biovec-2
> 140 94 67% 3.00K 70 2 560K biovec-2
> 74 56 75% 3.00K 37 2 296K biovec-2
> 144 102 70% 3.00K 72 2 576K biovec-2
> 114 82 71% 3.00K 57 2 456K biovec-2
> 154 116 75% 3.00K 77 2 616K biovec-2
> 80 60 75% 3.00K 40 2 320K biovec-2
> 164 122 74% 3.00K 82 2 656K biovec-2
> 152 114 75% 3.00K 76 2 608K biovec-2
> 70 46 65% 3.00K 35 2 280K biovec-2
> 1004 1004 100% 3.00K 502 2 4016K biovec-2
> 1952 1952 100% 3.00K 976 2 7808K biovec-2
> 2946 2946 100% 3.00K 1473 2 11784K biovec-2
> 3876 3876 100% 3.00K 1938 2 15504K biovec-2
> 4858 4858 100% 3.00K 2429 2 19432K biovec-2
> 5844 5844 100% 3.00K 2922 2 23376K biovec-2
> 6782 6782 100% 3.00K 3391 2 27128K biovec-2
> 7766 7766 100% 3.00K 3883 2 31064K biovec-2
> 8774 8774 100% 3.00K 4387 2 35096K biovec-2
> 9774 9774 100% 3.00K 4887 2 39096K biovec-2
> 10750 10750 100% 3.00K 5375 2 43000K biovec-2

> 11696 11696 100% 3.00K 5848 2 46784K biovec-2
> 12700 12700 100% 3.00K 6350 2 50800K biovec-2
> 13676 13676 100% 3.00K 6838 2 54704K biovec-2
> 14644 14644 100% 3.00K 7322 2 58576K biovec-2
> 15620 15620 100% 3.00K 7810 2 62480K biovec-2
> 16568 16568 100% 3.00K 8284 2 66272K biovec-2
> 17582 17582 100% 3.00K 8791 2 70328K biovec-2
> 18562 18562 100% 3.00K 9281 2 74248K biovec-2
> 19558 19558 100% 3.00K 9779 2 78232K biovec-2
> 20500 20500 100% 3.00K 10250 2 82000K biovec-2
> 21424 21424 100% 3.00K 10712 2 85696K biovec-2
> 22414 22414 100% 3.00K 11207 2 89656K biovec-2
> 23404 23404 100% 3.00K 11702 2 93616K biovec-2
> 25252 25252 100% 3.00K 12626 2 101008K biovec-2
> 27192 27192 100% 3.00K 13596 2 108768K biovec-2
> 29172 29172 100% 3.00K 14586 2 116688K biovec-2
> 31112 31112 100% 3.00K 15556 2 124448K biovec-2
> 33006 33006 100% 3.00K 16503 2 132024K biovec-2
> 34998 34926 99% 3.00K 17499 2 139992K biovec-2
> 36820 36820 100% 3.00K 18410 2 147280K biovec-2
> 38750 38750 100% 3.00K 19375 2 155000K biovec-2
> 40480 40480 100% 3.00K 20240 2 161920K biovec-2
> 42362 42362 100% 3.00K 21181 2 169448K biovec-2
> 44264 44264 100% 3.00K 22132 2 177056K biovec-2
> 46182 46182 100% 3.00K 23091 2 184728K biovec-2
> 48058 48058 100% 3.00K 24029 2 192232K biovec-2
> 49982 49974 99% 3.00K 24991 2 199928K biovec-2
> 51894 51894 100% 3.00K 25947 2 207576K biovec-2
> 53828 53808 99% 3.00K 26914 2 215312K biovec-2
> 55596 55596 100% 3.00K 27798 2 222384K biovec-2
> 57484 57484 100% 3.00K 28742 2 229936K biovec-2
> 59352 59352 100% 3.00K 29676 2 237408K biovec-2
> 61304 61286 99% 3.00K 30652 2 245216K biovec-2
>
> Joe
>
> On Sat, Mar 24, 2012 at 11:40 AM, Kirill Korotaev <dev@parallels.com>wrote:
>
>> Can you please report slabtop output? We've just fixed obe memory leak.
>> Thanks!
>>
>> Sent from my iPhonespam SPAMSPAM
>>
>> On 24.03.2012, at 21:57, "jjs - mainphrame" <jjs@mainphrame.com> wrote:
>>
>> > I've been creating simfs and ploop based containers and exercising them
>> in different ways. While the ploop-based containers are basically working,
>> in my testing a ploop-based CT seems to require more resources than an

>> equivalent simfs-based CT. On my modest 32 bit test rig with 1 GB RAM, I've
>> been running dbench on simfs based CTs and looking at performance with new
>> kernel versions. But when running dbench tests on a ploop based CT with the
>> same resources, it has not been able to finish because the machine runs out
>> of resources, performance slows to a crawl and even host processes are
>> killed off.
>> >
>> > I'll try to get some more memory for this machine for further testing.
>> >
>> > Regards,
>> >
>> > Joe
>> > <ATT00001.c>
>>
> <ATT00001.c>
>
>