
Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 00/28] kmem limitation for memcg
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Mon, 28 May 2012 08:32:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 05/25/2012 06:34 PM, Christoph Lameter wrote:

> On Fri, 25 May 2012, Michal Hocko wrote:

>

>> On Fri 25-05-12 17:03:20, Glauber Costa wrote:

>>> I believe some of the early patches here are already in some trees around.

>>> I don't know who should pick this, so if everyone agrees with what's in here,

>>> please just ack them and tell me which tree I should aim for (-mm? Hocko's?)

>>> and I'll rebase it.

>>

>> memcg-devel tree is only to make development easier. Everything that

>> applies on top of this tree should be applicable to both -mm and

>> linux-next.

>> So the patches should go via traditional Andrew's channel.

>

> It would be best to merge these with my patchset to extract common code

> from the allocators. The modifications of individual slab allocators would

> then be not necessary anymore and it would save us a lot of work.

>

Some of them would not, some of them would still be. But also please
note that the patches here that deal with differences between allocators
are usually the low hanging fruits compared to the rest.

I agree that long term it not only better, but inevitable, if we are
going to merge both.

But right now, I think we should agree with the implementation itself -
so if you have any comments on how I am handling these, I'd be happy to
hear. Then we can probably set up a tree that does both, or get your
patches merged and I'll rebase, etc.
