

Re: [Soekris] Re: bridge with access on both interfaces

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/net/2003-12/0199.html>

From: Poul-Henning Kamp (*phk_at_phk.freebsd.dk*)

Date: 12/25/03

To: Luigi Rizzo <rizzo@icir.org>

Date: Thu, 25 Dec 2003 19:41:20 +0100

In message <20031225102549.A79161@xorpc.icir.org>, Luigi Rizzo writes:

>If you have shared interrupts, and one of the interfaces is not up, you
>end up doing a lot of useless calls to *sis_stop()*, which is terribly
>expensive (it even includes a *DELAY(1000)* call).
>At the very least, one should add a 'stopped' flag so that
>*sis_stop()* is only called when necessary -- or possibly even
>never at all.
>
>The second (minor) cause of performance loss are the calls
>(not shown above)
>to disable and re-enable the interrupts around the driver. These are
>completely useless, yet cause some extra PCI transactions.

I don't know if it is correct, but at the very least I have thought the same thoughts when I looked at the driver last, but I didn't get time to try out the idea...

Somebody with some spare time should look at this...

Poul-Henning

--

Poul-Henning Kamp | UNIX since Zilog Zeus 3.20
phk@FreeBSD.ORG | TCP/IP since RFC 956
FreeBSD committer | BSD since 4.3-tahoe
Never attribute to malice what can adequately be explained by incompetence.

freebsd-net@freebsd.org mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-net>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-net-unsubscribe@freebsd.org"