

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 06/11] memcg: kmem controller infrastructure

Posted by [David Rientjes](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2012 04:01:32 GMT

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

---

On Tue, 26 Jun 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:

```
>>> @@ -416,6 +423,43 @@ static inline void sock_update_memcg(struct sock *sk)
>>> static inline void sock_release_memcg(struct sock *sk)
>>> {
>>> }
>>> +
>>> +#define mem_cgroup_kmem_on 0
>>> +#define __mem_cgroup_new_kmem_page(a, b, c) false
>>> +#define __mem_cgroup_free_kmem_page(a,b )
>>> +#define __mem_cgroup_commit_kmem_page(a, b, c)
>>> +#define is_kmem_tracked_alloc (false)
>>> #endif /* CONFIG_CGROUP_MEM_RES_CTLR_KMEM */
>>> +
>>> +static __always_inline
>>> +bool mem_cgroup_new_kmem_page(gfp_t gfp, void *handle, int order)
>>> +{
>>> + if (!mem_cgroup_kmem_on)
>>> + return true;
>>> + if (!is_kmem_tracked_alloc)
>>> + return true;
>>> + if (!current->mm)
>>> + return true;
>>> + if (in_interrupt())
>>> + return true;
>>>
>> You can't test for current->mm in irq context, so you need to check for
>> in_interrupt() first.
>>
> Right, thanks.
>
>> Also, what prevents __mem_cgroup_new_kmem_page()
>> from being called for a kthread that has called use_mm() before
>> unuse_mm()?
>
> Nothing, but I also don't see how to prevent that.
```

You can test for `current->flags & PF_KTHREAD` following the check for `in_interrupt()` and return true, it's what you were trying to do with the check for `!current->mm`.

---