
Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 06/11] memcg: kmem controller infrastructure
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Wed, 15 Aug 2012 14:01:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 08/15/2012 05:09 PM, Michal Hocko wrote:

> On Wed 15-08-12 13:42:24, Glauber Costa wrote:

> [...]

>>>> +

>>>> + ret = 0;

>>>> +

>>>> + if (!memcg)

>>>> + return ret;

>>>> +

>>>> + _memcg = memcg;

>>>> + ret = __mem_cgroup_try_charge(NULL, gfp, delta / PAGE_SIZE,

>>>> + &_memcg, may_oom);

>>>

>>> This is really dangerous because atomic allocation which seem to be

>>> possible could result in deadlocks because of the reclaim.

>>

>> Can you elaborate on how this would happen?

>

> Say you have an atomic allocation and we hit the limit so we get either

> to reclaim which can sleep or to oom which can sleep as well (depending

> on the oom_control).

>

I see now, you seem to be right.

How about we change the following code in mem_cgroup_do_charge:

```
if (gfp_mask & __GFP_NORETRY)
    return CHARGE_NOMEM;
```

to:

```
if ((gfp_mask & __GFP_NORETRY) || (gfp_mask & __GFP_ATOMIC))
    return CHARGE_NOMEM;
```

?

Would this take care of the issue ?
