Subject: Re: [PATCH] memory cgroup enhancements [1/5] force_empty for memory cgroup

Posted by KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki on Wed, 17 Oct 2007 05:26:42 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Wed, 17 Oct 2007 10:35:58 +0530
Balbir Singh <balbir@linux.vnet.ibm.com> wrote:
> > If the only use of this is for rmdir, why not just make it part of the
>> rmdir operation on the memory cgroup if there are no tasks by default?
> >
>
> That's a good idea, but sometimes an administrator might want to force
> a cgroup empty and start fresh without necessary deleting the cgroup.
>
I'll make a "automatic force_empty at rmdir()" patch as another patch depends
on this. If we make concensus that "force_empty interface is redundant", I'll
remove it later.
> I am not convinced of this hack either, specially the statement of
> setting count to SWAP_CLUSTER_MAX.
Just because I think there should be "unlock and rest" in this busy loop,
I need some number. Should I define other number?
as
#define FORCE_RECALIM_BATCH (128)
>>> + /* drop all page cgroup in inactive list */
>>> + mem_cgroup_force_empty_list(mem, &mem->inactive_list);
> >> + }
> >
> > This implementation as a while loop looks very suspect since
>> mem_cgroup_force_empty_list() uses while (!list_empty(list)) as well.
> > Perhaps it's just easier here as
> if (list_empty(&mem->active_list) && list_empty(&mem->inactive_list))
>> return 0;
> >
> Do we VM BUG ON() in case the lists are not empty after calling
> mem_cgroup_force_empty_list()
Okay, I will add.
>> Reading memory force empty is pretty useless, so why allow it to be read
> > at all?
```

> I agree, this is not required. I wonder if we could set permissions at
> group level to mark this file as *write only*. We could use the new
> read_uint and write_uint callbacks for reading/writing integers.
>
ok, will remove.

Thanks,
-Kame

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