

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v8 1/9] Basic kernel memory functionality for the Memory Controller

Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Fri, 09 Dec 2011 14:48:16 GMT

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

---

On 12/09/2011 12:44 PM, David Laight wrote:

```
>
>> How about this?
>>
>>     val = !!val;
>>
>>     /*
>>      * This follows the same hierarchy restrictions than
>>      * mem_cgroup_hierarchy_write()
>>      */
>>     if (!parent || !parent->use_hierarchy) {
>>         if (list_empty(&cgroup->children))
>>             memcg->kmem_independent_accounting = val;
>>         else
>>             return -EBUSY;
>>     }
>>     else
>>         return -EINVAL;
>>
>>     return 0;
>
> Inverting the tests gives easier to read code:
>
> if (parent&& parent->user_hierarchy)
>     return -EINVAL;
> if (!list_empty(&cgroup->children))
>     return -EBUSY;
> memcg->kmem_independent_accounting = val != 0;
> return 0;
```

On the other hand, inconsistent with `mem_cgroup_hierarchy_write()`, which applies the logic in the same way I did here.

```
> NFI about the logic...
> On the face of it the tests don't seem related to each other
> or to the assignment!
```

How so?

If parent's `use_hierarchy` is set, we can't set this value (we need to have a parent for that to even matter).

We also can't set it if we already have any children - otherwise all the

on-the-fly adjustments become hell-on-earth.

As for `= val != 0`, sorry, but I completely disagree this is easier than `!!val`. Not to mention the `!!val` notation is already pretty widespread in the kernel.

> David

>

>

>

>

> --

> To unsubscribe, send a message with 'unsubscribe linux-mm' in  
> the body to majordomo@kvack.org. For more info on Linux MM,

> see: <http://www.linux-mm.org/> .

> Fight unfair telecom internet charges in Canada: sign <http://stopthemeteter.ca/>

> Don't email:<[a href=mailto:dont@kvack.org](mailto:dont@kvack.org)> email@kvack.org</a>

---