## Subject: Re: [PATCH][RFC] dirty balancing for cgroups Posted by KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki on Fri, 11 Jul 2008 07:09:52 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Fri, 11 Jul 2008 14:59:26 +0900 (JST) yamamoto@valinux.co.jp (YAMAMOTO Takashi) wrote:

>>> - This looks simple but, could you merge this into memory resource controller?
>>> > why?
>>> 3 points.
>> 1. Is this useful if used alone?
>> it can be. why not?
>> 2. memcg requires this kind of feature, basically.
>> 3. I wonder I need more work to make this work well under memcg.
>> i'm not sure if i understand these points. can you explain a bit?
>> In my understanding, dirty\_ratio is for helping memory (reclaim) subsystem.

See comments in fs/page-writeback.c:: determin\_dirtyable\_memory()

==

\* Work out the current dirty-memory clamping and background writeout

\* thresholds.

\* The main aim here is to lower them aggressively if there is a lot of mapped

\* memory around. To avoid stressing page reclaim with lots of unreclaimable

\* pages. It is better to clamp down on writers than to start swapping, and

\* performing lots of scanning.

\* We only allow 1/2 of the currently-unmapped memory to be dirtied.

\* We don't permit the clamping level to fall below 5% - that is getting rather

\* excessive.

\* We make sure that the background writeout level is below the adjusted

\* clamping level.

==

"To avoid stressing page reclaim with lots of unreclaimable pages"

Then, I think memcg should support this for helping relcaim under memcg.

- > my patch penalizes heavy-writer cgroups as task\_dirty\_limit does
- > for heavy-writer tasks. i don't think that it's necessary to be
- > tied to the memory subsystem because i merely want to group writers.

>

Hmm, maybe what I need is different from this;)
Does not seem to be a help for memory reclaim under memcg.

Thanks,
-Kame

\_\_\_\_\_

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