

---

Subject: Re: Fork bomb limitation in memcg WAS: Re: [PATCH 00/11] kmem controller for memcg: stripped down ve

Posted by [Frederic Weisbecker](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2012 15:40:11 GMT

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

---

On Tue, Jul 03, 2012 at 03:38:39PM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:

> On 06/29/2012 02:25 AM, Andrew Morton wrote:

> > On Thu, 28 Jun 2012 13:01:23 +0400

> > Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com> wrote:

> >

> >>

> >> ...

> >>

> >

> > OK, that all sounds convincing ;) Please summarise and capture this

> > discussion in the [patch 0/n] changelog so we (or others) don't have to

> > go through this all again. And let's remember this in the next

> > patchset!

>

> Thanks, will surely do.

>

> >> Last, but not least, note that it is totally within my interests to

> >> merge the slab tracking as fast as we can. it'll be a matter of going

> >> back to it, and agreeing in the final form.

> >

> > Yes, I'd very much like to have the whole slab implementation in a

> > reasonably mature state before proceeding too far with this base

> > patchset.

>

> Does that means that you want to merge them together? I am more than

> happy to post the slab part again ontop of that to have people reviewing it.

>

> But if possible, I believe that merging this part first would help us to

> split up testing in a beneficial way, in the sense that if it breaks, we

> know at least in which part it is. Not to mention, of course, that

> reviewers will have an easier time reviewing it as two pieces.

Definetly yeah. This makes the review easier for this tricky chunk.

---