

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] new cgroup controller &quot;fork&quot;  
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Fri, 18 Feb 2011 00:59:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thu, Feb 17, 2011 at 5:31 AM, Max Kellermann <mk@cm4all.com> wrote:  
> Can limit the number of fork()/clone() calls in a cgroup. It is  
> useful as a safeguard against fork bombs.

I'd be inclined to simplify this a bit - avoid impacting the fork()  
path twice, with cgroup\_fork\_pre\_fork() and cgroup\_fork\_fork() and  
just do the checks and decrements in a single pass. (In the event of  
hitting a limit, you may need to make another partial pass up the tree  
to restore the charged fork attempts)

Yes, it's true that you might charge for a fork() that later failed  
for some other reason, but this will very rare (except on a machine  
that's already screwed for other reasons) so that I don't think anyone  
would complain about it. Especially if you explicitly document  
"fork.remaining" as number of permitted "fork attempts".

Also, it would be slightly clearer to use fork\_cgroup\_\* rather than  
cgroup\_fork\_\* - this makes it clearer that it's part of a cgroups  
subsystem called "fork", rather than part of the cgroups core  
framework.

I don't think that you need to make your spinlock IRQ-safe - AFAICS  
nothing accesses it from the interrupt path.

Paul

---

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

---