

## Re: Is 6.x slower then 4.x ... ?

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/performance/2006-07/msg00033.html>

---

- *From:* Andreas Hauser <[andy-freebsd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:andy-freebsd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 17 Jul 2006 11:09:57 +0200
- 

brooks wrote @ Sun, 16 Jul 2006 22:02:50 -0500:

On Sun, Jul 16, 2006 at 11:49:35AM -0300, User FreeBSD wrote:

FreeBSD 6 is slower than 4 for some things and faster for others. That should be expected since fine grained locking involves increased numbers of expensive atomic operations (which are particularly bad on Intel P4 and Xeon systems). The gain is that we've got significantly more parallelism in many areas (for example, see kris's I/O benchmarking presented at BSDCan). Looking at it as a thought experiment, you should expect microbenchmarks to perform worse, sometimes much worse. If your application looks like those microbenchmarks that's going to be a problem, if not it may or may not be.

OK. Kris presented exactly one benchmark were 6 is better (30%) and that is with sync mounts. Sorry, but i don't know many people running async mounts.

Since none of the benchmarks from people seem to have influence on you, why not provide benchmarks, application ones, that show that 6 is good in anything performance wise. Until then we keep thinking it is worse, since our benchmarking shows it to be worse (of course we are doing it all wrong ...).

In short the black and white question you are asking makes little sense. :)

It usually boils down to a black and white question like "Use or do not use?".

—  
Andy

---

Re: Is 6.x slower then 4.x ... ?

freebsd-performance@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list

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

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