

---

Subject: Skylark logs failure in accept()  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Sat, 01 Sep 2012 13:03:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi,

I'm running a Skylark based server app and I get a lot of this error in the log:  
Quote:Accept failed: accept: Resource temporarily unavailableIt appears on average once every 10 requests or so. When I run the same server single-threaded in debug mode it doesn't happen. I don't know the socket stuff good enough to point my finger at the culprit, but it seems as if sometimes one thread tries to handle a request that is already being handled by some other thread. As far as I can say it doesn't affect the behavior of the app, so it is not really a bug - but if it didn't happen the app might have slightly better performance

Honza

---

---

Subject: Re: Skylark logs failure in accept()  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sun, 02 Sep 2012 06:59:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Interesting.

I think it is caused by something wrong in our emulation of "blocking" accept.

```
bool TcpSocket::Accept(TcpSocket& ls)
{
    Close();
    Init();
    Reset();
    ASSERT(ls.IsOpen());
    if(timeout) { // <<< Timeout should be Null
        int h = ls.GetTimeout();
        bool b = ls.Timeout(timeout).Wait(WAIT_READ, GetEndTime()); // <<< This should do the
        waiting until some request is available
        ls.Timeout(h);
        if(!b)
            return false;
    }
    socket = accept(ls.GetSOCKET(), NULL, NULL);
    if(socket == INVALID_SOCKET) {
        SetSockError("accept");
        return false;
    }
    mode = ACCEPT;
    return SetupSocket();
}
```

Basically, error reported is EAGAIN, which is sort of "non-error", it only means that operation should be performed again later. But it should not happen anyway...

On the other way, if there is a "legal" way how it can get EAGAIN there, easy fix would be to return false for EAGAIN and timeout not Null and to loop back if timeout is Null (to be blocking).

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Skylark logs failure in accept()  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sun, 02 Sep 2012 08:10:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Now, thinking about it, I guess it can rather be associated with prefork... Do you have prefork > 1 ?

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Skylark logs failure in accept()  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Sun, 02 Sep 2012 10:08:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mirek wrote on Sun, 02 September 2012 10:10Now, thinking about it, I guess it can rather be associated with prefork... Do you have prefork > 1 ?

Mirek

Oops, I forgot to mention that. I run the server with prefork=2 and threads at default (machine has 1 CPU -> 4 threads).

I will publish the sources in couple of days, I just need to fix couple last errors I found when I run it in production settings, so then it will be available for testing.

Honza

---

---

Subject: Re: Skylark logs failure in accept()  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 03 Sep 2012 09:07:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I believe that if my prefork hypothesis was correct, it should be now fixed.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Skylark logs failure in accept()  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Mon, 03 Sep 2012 10:24:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mirek wrote on Mon, 03 September 2012 11:07I believe that if my prefork hypothesis was correct, it should be now fixed.

Mirek  
Recompiled and deployed, so far it seems to work well

Thanks,  
Honza

---