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

Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2012 17:56:20 GMT

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

(2012/08/11 2:28), Michal Hocko wrote:

> On Sat 11-08-12 01:49:25, KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki wrote:

>> (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.

>

> right you are.

>

>>> 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" ?

>

> dunno, it would require a new parameter anyway (because abusing gfp

> doesn't seem great idea).

>

ok, agreed.

-Kame
