
Subject: Re: [PATCH -mm 5/5] swapcgroup (v3): implement force_empty
Posted by [Daisuke Nishimura](#) on Fri, 04 Jul 2008 07:26:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi, Yamamoto-san.

Thank you for your comment.

On Fri, 4 Jul 2008 15:54:31 +0900 (JST), yamamoto@valinux.co.jp (YAMAMOTO Takashi) wrote:

```
> hi,
>
> > +/*
> > + * uncharge all the entries that are charged to the group.
> > + */
> > +void __swap_cgroup_force_empty(struct mem_cgroup *mem)
> > +{
> > + struct swap_info_struct *p;
> > + int type;
> > +
> > + spin_lock(&swap_lock);
> > + for (type = swap_list.head; type >= 0; type = swap_info[type].next) {
> > + p = swap_info + type;
> > +
> > + if ((p->flags & SWP_ACTIVE) == SWP_ACTIVE) {
> > + unsigned int i = 0;
> > +
> > + spin_unlock(&swap_lock);
>
> what prevents the device from being swapoff'ed while you drop swap_lock?
>
Nothing.
```

After searching the entry to be uncharged(`find_next_to_unuse` below), I recheck under `swap_lock` whether the entry is charged to the group. Even if the device is swapoff'ed, `swap_off` must have uncharged the entry, so I don't think it's needed anyway.

> YAMAMOTO Takashi

```
>
> > + while ((i = find_next_to_unuse(p, i, mem)) != 0) {
> > + spin_lock(&swap_lock);
> > + if (p->swap_map[i] && p->memcg[i] == mem)
```

Ah, I think it should be added `!p->swap_map` to check the device has not been swapoff'ed.

Thanks,

Daisuke Nishimura.

```
>> + swap_cgroup_uncharge(p, i);  
>> + spin_unlock(&swap_lock);  
>> + }  
>> + spin_lock(&swap_lock);  
>> + }  
>> + }  
>> + spin_unlock(&swap_lock);  
>> +  
>> + return;  
>> +}  
>> #endif
```

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