
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] allow "unlimited" limit value.
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Wed, 26 Sep 2007 11:02:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Balbir Singh wrote:

> Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>> 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.

>>

>

> I disagree, numfile CG using 0 will not work, cause you'll not be able
> to do anything with 0, you can't even cat the numfile.limit file; for

So what? I'm the administrator and I don't want this particular subgroup
to open any files :)

> that matter anything with 0 will not work. You'll always exceed the

Yet again - I don't want some subgroup to consume any of some resource.
E.g. I don't want some subgroup to use any private pages :) shared
only, what can I do?

> limit.

>

> Setting 0 to mean unlimited might make sense.

Setting 0 as unlimited is used nowhere in the kernel, isn't it?

Thanks,
Pavel

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

