
Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/4] swapcgroup: implement charge/uncharge
Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Tue, 27 May 2008 13:42:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 26 May 2008 09:57:06 +0900
KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com> wrote:

> 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
> ...)

Now, force_empty() will create a page which is used but
page->page_cgroup is NULL page. I'm now writing a workaround (1/4 in my newest set)
but it's better to check page->page_cgroup is NULL or not.

Thanks,
-Kame

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