

Re: ten thousand small processes

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/performance/2003-06/0107.html>

From: Petri Helenius (pete_at_he.iki.fi)

Date: 06/26/03

To: "D. J. Bernstein" <djb@cr.yp.to>, <freebsd-performance@freebsd.org>

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 23:47:12 +0200

>

> *Funny. Seems to me that I keep making concrete suggestions---including a*
> *detailed proposal for giving more space to malloc()---and the answer is*
> *consistently ``We really don't care about per-process overhead." What's*
> *the benefit of a patch for people who don't even see the problem?*

>

Many programmers read and write C more fluently than they do english.

Code can also be run trough the common case benchmarks, proving that the improvements you suggest are not going to detoriate the 99.9%++ of users who don't have 10000 processes.

In general, not to dismiss the requirements, I think the design is broken if you require permission separation and memory separation between 10000 processes which run identical code, since that implies that either the code is badly designed, horribly broken or you expect it to be either or both. The only viable option would be that part of the executable actually comes somewhere else which kind of dismisses the optimization parameters because then the size would be unknown.

Memory is cheap and FreeBSD supports 64G of it.

Pete

freebsd-performance@freebsd.org mailing list

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

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