
Subject: Re: [RFC] Transactional CGroup task attachment
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Mon, 14 Jul 2008 19:16:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, Jul 13, 2008 at 11:28 PM, Daisuke Nishimura
<nishimura@mxp.nes.nec.co.jp> wrote:

>
> - I think page reclaiming code decreases the memory charge
> without holding mmap_sem(e.g. try_to_unmap(), __remove_mapping()).
> Shouldn't we handle these cases?

The prepare_attach_nosleep() call could take the res_counter's
spinlock, which would lock out all other charges and uncharges until
the transaction was completed; that might be enough for what you want.
We'd need to export lock/unlock functions from res_counter.

Paul

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