

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 02/11] memcg: Reclaim when more than one page needed.

Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2012 16:49:25 GMT

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

---

(2012/08/11 0:42), Michal Hocko wrote:

> On Thu 09-08-12 17:01:10, Glauber Costa wrote:

> [...]

```
>> @@ -2317,18 +2318,18 @@ static int mem_cgroup_do_charge(struct mem_cgroup *memcg,
gfp_t gfp_mask,
```

```
>> } else
```

```
>> mem_over_limit = mem_cgroup_from_res_counter(fail_res, res);
```

```
>> /*
```

```
>> - * nr_pages can be either a huge page (HPAGE_PMD_NR), a batch
```

```
>> - * of regular pages (CHARGE_BATCH), or a single regular page (1).
```

```
>> - *
```

```
>> * Never reclaim on behalf of optional batching, retry with a
```

```
>> * single page instead.
```

```
>> */
```

```
>> - if (nr_pages == CHARGE_BATCH)
```

```
>> + if (nr_pages > min_pages)
```

```
>> return CHARGE_RETRY;
```

```
>
```

> This is dangerous because THP charges will be retried now while they

> previously failed with CHARGE\_NOMEM which means that we will keep

> attempting potentially endlessly.

with THP, I thought nr\_pages == min\_pages, and no retry.

> Why cannot we simply do if (nr\_pages < CHARGE\_BATCH) and get rid of the

> min\_pages altogether?

Hm, I think a slab can be larger than CHARGE\_BATCH.

> Also the comment doesn't seem to be valid anymore.

>

I agree it's not clean. Because our assumption on nr\_pages are changed,

I think this behavior should not depend on nr\_pages value..

Shouldn't we have a flag to indicate "trial-for-batched charge" ?

Thanks,

-Kame

---