

Re: ten thousand small processes

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/performance/2003-06/0118.html>

From: Terry Lambert (tlambert2_at_mindspring.com)

Date: 06/27/03

Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 04:39:10 -0700

To: "D. J. Bernstein" <djb@cr.yp.to>

"D. J. Bernstein" wrote:

> *Bakul Shah writes:*

> > *Instead of complaining about wasting 78 megabytes and arguing*

> > *about why various proposed solutions fall short and why your*

> > *way is the best, why don't you come up with a patch that*

> > *saves space for small programs?*

>

> *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?*

Your "concrete proposal for malloc" made a number of bad assumptions:

- o "UVA == 4G", rather than "UVA + KVA == 4G"

 - Costs to move to "UVA == 4G":

 - o pages must be mapped before each copy of

 - data across a protection domain

 - o pages must be unmapped afterwards

- o If we had access to another 2G of UVA, we'd have no better use for it than to make malloc more space efficient

My answer, at least, was "too computationally expensive for a general purpose OS when making the size/computational overhead tradeoff".

-- Terry

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"