

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/2] CFS CGroup: Report usage  
Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Tue, 23 Oct 2007 16:31:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, Oct 22, 2007 at 11:06:54PM -0700, Paul Menage wrote:

```
> > > +   for_each_possible_cpu(i) {  
> > > +       unsigned long flags;  
> > > +       spin_lock_irqsave(&tg->cfs_rq[i]->rq->lock, flags);  
> >  
> > Is the lock absolutely required here?  
>  
> I'm not sure, I was hoping you or Ingo could comment on this. But some  
> kind of locking seems to required at least on 32-bit platforms, since  
> sum_exec_runtime is a 64-bit number.
```

I tend to agree abt 32-bit platforms requiring a lock to read the 64-bit sum\_exec\_runtime field.

Ingo/Dmitry, what do you think? fs/proc/array.c:task\_utime() is also buggy in that case.

--  
Regards,  
vatsa

---

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

---