
Subject: Re: [ckrm-tech] [RFC][PATCH 2/7] UBC: core (structures, API)
Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Tue, 22 Aug 2006 12:23:29 GMT

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

On Mon, Aug 21, 2006 at 03:02:17PM +0400, Kirill Korotaev wrote:

> > Except that you eventually have to lock ub0. Seems that the cache line
> > for that spinlock could bounce quite a bit in such a hot path.
> do you mean by ub0 host system ub which we call ub0
> or you mean a top ub?

If this were used for pure resource management purpose (w/o containers)
then the top ub would be ub0 right? "How bad would the contention on the
ub0->lock be then" is I guess Matt's question.

--

Regards,
vatsa
