

---

Subject: Re: seems to be a flaw in cfq

Posted by [Vasily Tarasov](#) on Thu, 21 Dec 2006 12:16:50 GMT

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

---

Hello,

On 2.6.19 "buffered randread" bizarre behavior persists. So it was fixed somewhere in 2.6.20... Can you give me a guess, what changes in 2.6.20 cause this fix? The point is that we want to port it back to 2.6.18 (rhel-5), if possible.

Thanks,  
Vasily.

Jens Axboe wrote:

> On Thu, Dec 21 2006, Jens Axboe wrote:

>

>> On Thu, Dec 21 2006, Vasily Tarasov wrote:

>>

>>> Hello, Jens,

>>>

>>> Sorry for late answer.

>>> The situation is the following:

>>>

>>> direct seqread

>>> (2.6.18) - reproducible

>>> (2.6.20-rc1) - reproducible

>>> (2.6.20-rc1 + your fix) - not reproducible

>>>

>>> buffered randread

>>> (2.6.18) - reproducible

>>> (2.6.20-rc1) - not reproducible

>>> (2.6.20-rc1 + your fix) - not reproducible

>>>

>>> So the conclusion: problem with "direct seqread" is fixed by your patch

>>> (thanks!) and

>>> the problem with "buffered randread" was fixed in 2.6.19/2.6.20.

>>>

>> Perfect, explains why I didn't see much badness with buffered io on

>> 2.6.20-rc1'ish. Thanks for retesting and the initial report, the fix I

>> sent you is going upstream (sitting in the 'for-linus' branch awaiting a

>> pull) for 2.6.20-rc2.

>>

>

> Oh, Linus just pulled a few minutes ago, the fix is already upstream

> now.

---