

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 06/11] memcg: kmem controller infrastructure  
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Thu, 16 Aug 2012 09:57:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 08/16/2012 01:53 PM, Michal Hocko wrote:

> On Wed 15-08-12 18:27:45, Glauber Costa wrote:

>>

>>>>

>>>> I see now, you seem to be right.

>>>

>>> No I am not because it seems that I am really blind these days...

>>> We were doing this in mem\_cgroup\_do\_charge for ages:

>>> if (!(gfp\_mask & \_\_GFP\_WAIT))

>>> return CHARGE\_WOULDBLOCK;

>>>

>>> /me goes to hide and get with further feedback with a clean head.

>>>

>>> Sorry about that.

>>>

>> I am as well, since I went to look at mem\_cgroup\_do\_charge() and missed  
>> that.

>

> I thought we are not doing atomic allocations in user pages accounting

> but I was obviously wrong because at least shmem uses atomic

> allocations for ages.

>

>> Do you have any other concerns specific to this patch ?

>

> I understood you changed also handle thingy. So the patch should be

> correct.

> Do you plan to send an updated version?

>

That depends more on you than on me! =)

Do you still have any concerns regarding the u+k charging as it stands  
now? That would be the last big concern I heard during this iteration.

If you are happy with the answers you got so far, and believe it is  
acceptable to proceed with the charging this way, I will be ready to  
send an updated version soon.

---