

---

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>

---