

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v4 23/25] memcg: propagate kmem limiting information to children

Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Tue, 19 Jun 2012 00:16:20 GMT

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

---

(2012/06/18 21:43), Glauber Costa wrote:

> On 06/18/2012 04:37 PM, Kamezawa Hiroyuki wrote:

>> (2012/06/18 19:28), Glauber Costa wrote:

>>> The current memcg slab cache management fails to present satisfactory hierarchical  
>>> behavior in the following scenario:

>>>

>>> -> /cgroups/memory/A/B/C

>>>

>>> \* kmem limit set at A

>>> \* A and B empty taskwise

>>> \* bash in C does find /

>>>

>>> Because kmem\_accounted is a boolean that was not set for C, no accounting  
>>> would be done. This is, however, not what we expect.

>>>

>>

>> Hmm....do we need this new routines even while we have mem\_cgroup\_iter() ?

>>

>> Doesn't this work ?

>>

>> struct mem\_cgroup {

>> .....

>> bool kmem\_accounted\_this;

>> atomic\_t kmem\_accounted;

>> ....

>> }

>>

>> at set limit

>>

>> ....set\_limit(memcg) {

>>

>> if (newly accounted) {

>> mem\_cgroup\_iter() {

>> atomic\_inc(&iter->kmem\_accounted)

>> }

>> } else {

>> mem\_cgroup\_iter() {

>> atomic\_dec(&iter->kmem\_accounted);

>> }

>> }

>>

>>

>> hm ? Then, you can see kmem is accounted or not by

```
atomic_read(&memcg->kmem_accounted);
```

```
>>
```

```
>
```

```
> Accounted by itself / parent is still useful, and I see no reason to use  
> an atomic + bool if we can use a pair of bits.
```

```
>
```

```
> As for the routine, I guess mem_cgroup_iter will work... It does a lot  
> more than I need, but for the sake of using what's already in there, I  
> can switch to it with no problems.
```

```
>
```

Hmm. please start from reusing existing routines.

If it's not enough, some enhancement for generic cgroup will be welcomed rather than completely new one only for memcg.

Thanks,  
-Kame

---