
Subject: Re: [PATCH] memory.min_usage

Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Tue, 04 Dec 2007 05:58:31 GMT

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

On Tue, 4 Dec 2007 13:09:34 +0900 (JST)

yamamoto@valinux.co.jp (YAMAMOTO Takashi) wrote:

> hi,
>
> here's a patch to implement memory.min_usage,
> which controls the minimum memory usage for a cgroup.
>
Thanks.

> todo:

> - restrict non-root user's operation regardless of owner of cgroupfs files?

I like 'only-for-root' user. or CAP_SYS_RESOURCE.

> - make oom killer aware of this?

>

For OOM-Killer, IMHO, no care is necessary (now).

This function can be considered as a kind of mlock(). A user can be aware of memory usage.

But, we may need some logic/reason to request this function.

> + unsigned long long min_usage; /* XXX should be a part of res_counter? */

> /*

Maybe res_counter is better. (Added CC: to Pavel Emelianov)

> +int mem_cgroup_canreclaim(struct page *page, struct mem_cgroup *mem1)

> +{

> + struct page_cgroup *pc;

> + int result = 1;

> +

> + if (mem1 != NULL)

> + return 1;

> +

> + lock_page_cgroup(page);

> + pc = page_get_page_cgroup(page);

> + if (pc) {

> + struct mem_cgroup *mem2 = pc->mem_cgroup;

> + unsigned long long min_usage;

> +

> + BUG_ON(mem2 == NULL);

> + min_usage = mem2->min_usage;

> + if (min_usage != 0) {

```

> + unsigned long flags;
> +
> + spin_lock_irqsave(&mem2->res.lock, flags);
> + if (mem2->res.usage <= min_usage)
> +     result = 0;
> + spin_unlock_irqrestore(&mem2->res.lock, flags);
> + }
> + }
> + unlock_page_cgroup(page);
> +
> + return result;
> +}
> +

```

How about adding lock_and_get_page_cgroup(page)/put_page_cgroup() ?

```

==
struct page_cgroup *pc lock_and_get_page_cgroup(page)
{
    struct page_cgroup *pc;

    lock_page_cgroup(page);
    pc = page_get_page_cgroup(page);
    if (atomic_inc_not_zero(&pc->ref_cnt))
        pc = NULL;
    unlock_page_cgroup(page);
    return pc;
}

```

```

struct page_cgroup *pc put_page_cgroup(struct page_cgroup *pc)
{
    mem_cgroup_uncharge(pc);
}
==

```

BTW, how about add a status to res_counter ?

My (based on your) current patch uses watermark_state.

Maybe we can change it to be resource_state and show following status.

```

RES_STATE_HIT_LIMIT,
RES_STATE_ABOVE_HWATER,
RES_STATE_ABOVE_LWATER,
RES_STATE_STABLE, ?
RES_STATE_BELOW_MIN,

```

Useful ?

```

> static int alloc_mem_cgroup_per_zone_info(struct mem_cgroup *mem, int node)
> {
>     struct mem_cgroup_per_node *pn;
> --- linux-2.6.24-rc3-mm2-swappiness/mm/vmscan.c.BACKUP2 2007-12-03 13:52:22.000000000
+0900
> +++ linux-2.6.24-rc3-mm2-swappiness/mm/vmscan.c 2007-12-03 14:11:42.000000000 +0900
> @@ -531,6 +531,11 @@ static unsigned long shrink_page_list(st
>     referenced && page_mapping_inuse(page))
>     goto activate_locked;
>
>
> +#ifdef CONFIG_CGROUP_MEM_CONT
> + if (!mem_cgroup_canreclaim(page, sc->mem_cgroup))
> +     goto activate_locked;
> +#endif /* CONFIG_CGROUP_MEM_CONT */
> +

```

Maybe

```

==
if (scan_global_lru(sc) && !
    mem_cgroup_canreclaim(page, sc->mem_cgroup))
    goto activate_locked;
==

```

```

> #ifdef CONFIG_SWAP

> /*
>  * Anonymous process memory has backing store?
> @@ -1122,6 +1127,12 @@ static void shrink_active_list(unsigned
>     list_add(&page->lru, &l_active);
>     continue;
> }
> +#ifdef CONFIG_CGROUP_MEM_CONT
> + if (!mem_cgroup_canreclaim(page, sc->mem_cgroup)) {
> +     list_add(&page->lru, &l_active);
> +     continue;
> + }
here too.

```

Thanks,
-Kame

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