Subject: Re: [PATCH] memory.min_usage (seqlock for res_counter)
Posted by KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 00:34:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, 04 Dec 2007 14:10:42 +0300
Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

> KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:
> > This is seqlock version res_counter.
> > Maybe this this will reduce # of spin_lock.
> >
> > Pavel-san, How about this ?
>
> AFAIS the readlock is used only in the check_under_limit(),
> but I think, that even if we read usage and limit values
> in this case non-atomically, this won't result in any
> dramatic sequence at all. No?
>
Reader can detect *any* changes in res_counter member which happens
while they access res_counter between seq_begin/seq_retry.
Memory barrier and "sequence" of seq_lock guarantees this.
So..there is no dramatical situation.
(it's used for accesing xtime.)

I'm sorry if I miss your point.

Thanks,
-Kame

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