
Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/4] Add a __GFP_SLABMEMCG flag
Posted by [James Bottomley](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2012 00:56:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, 2012-06-08 at 14:31 -0500, Christoph Lameter wrote:

> On Fri, 8 Jun 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:

```
>  
>> */  
>> #define __GFP_NOTRACK_FALSE_POSITIVE (__GFP_NOTRACK)  
>>  
>> -#define __GFP_BITS_SHIFT 25 /* Room for N __GFP_FOO bits */  
>> +#define __GFP_BITS_SHIFT 26 /* Room for N __GFP_FOO bits */  
>> #define __GFP_BITS_MASK ((__force gfp_t)((1 << __GFP_BITS_SHIFT) - 1))
```

```
>  
> Please make this conditional on CONFIG_MEMCG or so. The bit can be useful  
> in particular on 32 bit architectures.
```

I really don't think that's at all a good idea. It's asking for trouble when we don't spot we have a flag overlap. It also means that we're trusting the reuser to know that their use case can never clash with CONFIG_MEMCG and I can't think of any configuration where this is possible currently.

I think making the flag define of __GFP_SLABMEMCG conditional might be a reasonable idea so we get a compile failure if anyone tries to use it when !CONFIG_MEMCG.

James
