
Subject: Re: [PATCH] Simplify memory controller and resource counter I/O
Posted by [Balbir Singh](#) on Fri, 05 Oct 2007 03:31:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul Menage wrote:

> Hi Balbir,
>
> Any thoughts on this patch?
>

Hi, Paul,

I remember seeing this patch, sorry for not responding earlier

> Cheers,
>
> Paul
>
> On 9/25/07, Paul Menage <menage@google.com> wrote:
>> Simplify the memory controller and resource counter I/O routines
>>
>> This patch strips out some I/O boilerplate from resource counters and
>> the memory controller. It also adds locking to the resource counter
>> reads and writes, and forbids writes to the root memory cgroup's limit
>> file.
>>

Forbidding writing to the root resource counter is a policy decision
I am unable to make up my mind about. It sounds right, but unless
we have a notion of unlimited resources, I am a bit concerned about
taking away this flexibility.

>> One arguable drawback to this patch is that the use of `memparse()` is
>> lost in the cleanup. Having said that, given the existing of shell
>> arithmetic, it's not clear to me that typing
>>

`memparse()`, makes it so much easier, we need to use it.

>> `echo ${2<<30} > memory.limit`
>>

Very geeky! I don't like it personally

>> is especially harder than
>>
>> `echo 2G > memory.limit`
>>

>> Signed-off-by: Paul Menage <menage@google.com>
>>

I like the read_uint() and write_uint() overall, but in the case of setting the limit, I'd still like the flexibility of having a strategy pattern that would make the UI more friendly.

Do read_uint() and write_uint(), just read and write unsigned integers?

[snip]

--

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>
