

Backport192 - Backport #5099

Backport r31875 load path performance problem

07/27/2011 01:27 AM - tenderlovmaking (Aaron Patterson)

Status:	Rejected	
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:	yugui (Yuki Sonoda)	
Description		
Would it be possible to backport r31875 to 1.9.2? I think 1.9.2 users are still suffering.		
Thanks!		

History

#1 - 08/04/2011 02:21 AM - joshk (Josh Kalderimis)

Hi Guys,

Please backport this fix to 1.9.2.

Travis CI (<http://travis-ci.org>) shows some great examples of the issues caused by the slow requires in 1.9.2.

For example the Rails test suite (<http://travis-ci.org#!/rails/rails/builds/64519>), especially the Raities tests, explodes from 13 minutes when we test it against 1.8.7 to 28mins on 1.9.2.

The Rails test suite does a lot of isolated testing, so although this is an exaggerated case, it goes to show how this requires issue slows down testing and development in general.

Here are some other tests which are slower to run on 1.9.2:

<http://travis-ci.org#!/intridge/omniauth/builds/57098>

<http://travis-ci.org#!/rspec/rspec-rails/builds/64368>

and finally

<http://travis-ci.org#!/mongoid/mongoid/builds/64365> (this is a great example of 1.8.7 vs 1.9.2 vs 1.9.3)

Kind Regards,

Josh and the Travis CI team

#2 - 08/04/2011 02:26 AM - antares (Michael Klishin)

I second this request. It is surprising how little attention this performance regression had gotten. Many applications went from 5 seconds load time to 35. Running a single test in some codebases now takes seconds instead of 0.1th of a second it used to take.

Please backport this to 1.9.2-head and make a release soon. Thank you.

#3 - 08/04/2011 02:26 AM - foca (Nicolás Sanguinetti)

+1!!! :)

#4 - 08/04/2011 02:30 AM - arunagw (Arun Agrawal)

+1 for this fix

#5 - 08/04/2011 02:31 AM - herestomwiththeweather (Tom Brown)

+1

#6 - 08/04/2011 02:31 AM - excid3 (Chris Oliver)

+1

#7 - 08/04/2011 02:33 AM - tee (Tee Parham)

+1

#8 - 08/04/2011 02:35 AM - luislavena (Luis Lavena)

Hello,

I believe Aaron's request, Josh Kalderimis reasoning and explanation are enough to describe this issue.

Please avoid flooding it with meaningless +1 that do not add value. It is clear the importance of this and the 1.9.2 maintainer will determine if the changes can be considered for backport or not.

Thank you.

#9 - 08/04/2011 02:39 AM - antares (Michael Klishin)

Luis: I am sorry but this and YAML parser bug backports have been ignored for months. It is time to step up and bring this to 1.9.2 maintainers attention. Issues like this make me strongly believe that Ruby Core Team doesn't give a damn about 1.9.2. If 35 freaking seconds is not enough of a reason to *backport*, I don't know what is.

#10 - 08/04/2011 02:40 AM - arrowcircle (Oleg Bovykin)

+1

#11 - 08/04/2011 02:44 AM - luislavena (Luis Lavena)

Michael Klishin wrote:

Luis: I am sorry but this and YAML parser bug backports have been ignored for months. It is time to step up and bring this to 1.9.2 maintainers attention. Issues like this make me strongly believe that Ruby Core Team doesn't give a damn about 1.9.2. If 35 freaking seconds is not enough of a reason to *backport*, I don't know what is.

The reasoning behind backports has been explained in the past. Bugs are candidates for backports as long it doesn't alter the default behavior of Ruby/stdlib/etc.

If you want to make more easy the life of the 1.9.2 maintainer, please, checkout the branch and perform the manual backport of the corresponding commits, then attach a diff here for the maintainer properly apply.

Sometimes what you consider "35 freaking seconds" takes time when you need to perform lot of other tasks.

Please, don't be disrespectful on other's time availability. If you're not pleased, then prove you're a better release maintainer and step up.

#12 - 08/04/2011 02:45 AM - ctcherry (Chris Cherry)

+1, Definitely!

#13 - 08/04/2011 02:53 AM - JSedivy (Jan Šedivý)

+1

#14 - 08/04/2011 03:09 AM - cwgem (Chris White)

- File *ruby-1.9.2-p290-load-path-backport.diff* added

Attached is a backport patch to be applied against ruby-1.9.2-p290. All of ruby compiles and make test shows no complaints. Though the function signatures are the same and I don't see the patch breaking anything, please apply and give it a shot for a 1.9.2 in an ISOLATED NON-PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT, unless that is you're feeling adventurous :)

#15 - 08/04/2011 05:19 AM - boblin (Bohuslav Blín)

+1.

Thank's Aaron for opening this painful issue.

#16 - 08/04/2011 03:15 PM - vishnu.atri (Vishnu Atrai)

It would be better to have it in ruby 1.9.2 . This patch looks good.

#17 - 08/04/2011 07:16 PM - kronos (Ivan Samsonov)

+1. It's very important for me and my projects

#18 - 08/04/2011 07:54 PM - eml (Emil Ahlbäck)

Definitely +1!

#19 - 05/30/2016 08:33 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

- Status changed from *Open* to *Rejected*

Files

ruby-1.9.2-p290-load-path-backport.diff

1016 Bytes

08/04/2011

cwgem (Chris White)