
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 Emelianov <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
seqlocks 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>
