
Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/4] swapcgroup: implement charge/uncharge
Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Mon, 26 May 2008 00:55:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, 23 May 2008 20:52:29 +0900

Daisuke Nishimura <nishimura@mxp.nes.nec.co.jp> wrote:

> On 2008/05/22 16:37 +0900, KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:

> > On Thu, 22 May 2008 15:20:05 +0900

> > Daisuke Nishimura <nishimura@mxp.nes.nec.co.jp> wrote:

> >

> >> +`#ifdef CONFIG_CGROUP_SWAP_RES_CTLR`

> >> +`int swap_cgroup_charge(struct page *page,`

> >> + `struct swap_info_struct *si,`

> >> + `unsigned long offset)`

> >> +`{`

> >> + `int ret;`

> >> + `struct page_cgroup *pc;`

> >> + `struct mem_cgroup *mem;`

> >> +

> >> + `lock_page_cgroup(page);`

> >> + `pc = page_get_page_cgroup(page);`

> >> + `if (unlikely(!pc))`

> >> + `mem = &init_mem_cgroup;`

> >> + `else`

> >> + `mem = pc->mem_cgroup;`

> >> + `unlock_page_cgroup(page);`

> >

> > If !pc, the page is used before memory controller is available. But is it

> > good to be charged to `init_mem_cgroup()` ?

> I'm sorry, but I can't understand this situation.

> memory controller is initialized at kernel initialization,

> so aren't processes created after it is initialized?

>

I think `add_to_page_cache()` may be called before `late_init`..I'll check again.

(Because I saw some panics related to it, but I noticed this is `_swap_` controller ...)

> > How about returning 'failure' in this case ? I think returning 'failure' here

> > is not so bad.

> >

> >

> Which of below do you mean by 'failure'?

>

> A. make it fail to get swap entry, so the page cannot be swapped out.

> B. don't charge this swap entry to any cgroup, but the page

> would be swapped out.

means A.

>
> I don't want to do B, because I don't want to make such
> not-charged-to-anywhere entries.
> And I've seen several times this condition(!pc) becomes true,
> so I charged to init_mem_cgroup.
>
>
> BTW, I noticed that almost all of functions I added by this patch set
> should check "mem_cgroup_subsys.disabled" first because it depend on
> memory cgroup.
>
Ah, yes, please.

Thanks,
-Kame

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