

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] memory.min\_usage (seqlock for res\_counter)  
Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 09:29:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed, 05 Dec 2007 12:12:22 +0300  
Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

> Sorry, let me explain it in other words.

>

> I think, that protection in reader, that guarantees that it  
> will see the valid result, is not very important - even if  
> we compare usage and limit not atomically nothing serious  
> will happen (in this particular case)

>

Maybe there is no serious situation (now).

But programmers don't assume that the function may not return trustable result.

And I think it shouldn't be trustable AMAP.

I'd like to use seq\_lock or res\_counter\_state, here.

BTW, I'm wondering I should hold off my patches until 2.6.25-rc series if they make things complex.

Thanks,  
-Kame

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---