
Subject: Re: Re: [Fwd: [PATCH -RSS 2/2] Fix limit check after reclaim]

Posted by [Balbir Singh](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 07:10:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> Balbir Singh wrote:

>> Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>>>> +static inline bool res_counter_check_under_limit(struct res_counter *cnt)

>>>> +{

>>>> + bool ret;

>>>> + unsigned long flags;

>>>> +

>>>> + spin_lock_irqsave(&cnt->lock, flags);

>>>> + ret = res_counter_limit_check_locked(cnt);

>>> We don't have to take the lock for such a check.

>>>

>>

>> This check without the lock could be racy and return incorrect

>> results -- leading to OOM.

>

> Maybe. Nevertheless, if we do not trust the return value of

> try_to_free_pages() then the code should probably look like

>

> while (1) {

> if (res_counter_charge() == 0)

> break;

>

> did_progress = try_to_free_pages();

> if (res_counter_charge() == 0)

> break;

>

> if (!did_progress)

> out_of_memory();

> }

>

Yes, this looks better.

> But in any case we must know for sure was at least one page

> freed or not...

>

> Thanks,

> Pavel

--

Warm Regards,

Balbir Singh

Linux Technology Center
IBM, ISTL

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
