Subject: Re: [PATCH] memory.min_usage (seqlock for res_counter) Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 09:32:26 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:

- > 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 be trustable AMAP.

Well... OK. Among other possible ways to achieve this goal seglocks is the most preferable one from my POV.

Thanks:)

> 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.

Actually, Andrew wrote that he will pay little attention to new functionality till 2.6.24 release, so I think that serious patches should really be held off.

That's why I don't send the kmem controller yet :(

- > Thanks,
- > -Kame

Thanks,

Pavel

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers