
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value.
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 09:45:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:

> On Wed, 26 Sep 2007 00:51:59 +0530
> Balbir Singh <balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com> wrote:
>
>> David Rientjes wrote:
>
>> Yes, I prefer 0 as well and had that in a series in the Lost World
>> of my earlier memory/RSS controller patches. I feel now that 0 is
>> a bit confusing, we don't use 0 to mean unlimited, unless we
>> treat the memory.limit_in_bytes value as boolean. 0 is false,
>> meaning there is no limit, > 0 is true, which means the limit
>> is set and the value is specified to the value read out.
>
> I prefer 0 than -1, too

Remember, that we may use resource counters for other control groups
0 would make ore sense, like for numfile CG. 0 can mean that this
group is not allowed to open any files. Treating 0 as unlimited for
some CGs and as 0 for others is a mess.

> Thanks,
> -Kame
>
>

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