
Subject: Re: [RFC][only for review] memory controller bacground reclaim [4/5]
high/low watermark for memory

Posted by [Balbir Singh](#) on Sat, 01 Dec 2007 10:45:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Paul Menage wrote:

> On Nov 28, 2007 12:56 AM, KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki

> <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com> wrote:

```
>> {
>> +     .name = "low_watermark_in_bytes",
>> +     .private = RES_LOW_WATERMARK,
>> +     .write = mem_cgroup_write,
>> +     .read = mem_cgroup_read,
>> + },
>> + {
>> +     .name = "high_watermark_in_bytes",
>> +     .private = RES_HIGH_WATERMARK,
>> +     .write = mem_cgroup_write,
>> +     .read = mem_cgroup_read,
>> + },
>
```

> From a style point of view, I dislike having the "in_bytes" suffix

> tacked on to all the memory controller filenames.

>

The idea came from Andrew, when he suggested it.

Please see /proc/sys/vm. We have files like min_free_kbytes, I think it's a good idea to tell the user what units are used.

> If people really want this to be self-documenting, how about we allow
> cgroup control files to specify metadata, which would be presented to
> the user via an auto-generated "api" file.

>

> As an example, the addition above might then look something like:

>

```
> {
> .name = "low_watermark",
> .units = "bytes",
> .description = "usage below which background reclaim stops",
> .write = mem_cgroup_write,
> .read = mem_cgroup_read,
> }
```

>

> which would correspond to a line in the "mem.api" auto-generated control file as

>

The user is expected to cat "memory.api" in order to figure out how to

use the file?

> low_watermark: usage below which background reclaim stops (bytes)

>

> Paul

--

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>
