Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 04/11] kmem accounting basic infrastructure
Posted by KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki on Fri, 17 Aug 2012 02:38:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(2012/08/13 17:36), Glauber Costa wrote:
> On 08/10/2012 09:02 PM, Kamezawa Hiroyuki wrote:
>> (2012/08/09 22:01), Glauber Costa wrote:
>>> This patch adds the basic infrastructure for the accounting of the slab
>>> caches. To control that, the following files are created:
>>>
>>>   * memory.kmem.usage_in_bytes
>>>   * memory.kmem.limit_in_bytes
>>>   * memory.kmem.failcnt
>>>   * memory.kmem.max_usage_in_bytes
>>>
>>> They have the same meaning of their user memory counterparts. They
>>> reflect the state of the "kmem" res_counter.
>>>
>>> The code is not enabled until a limit is set. This can be tested by the
>>> flag "kmem_accounted". This means that after the patch is applied, no
>>> behavioral changes exists for whoever is still using memcg to control
>>> their memory usage.
>>>
>>> We always account to both user and kernel resource_counters. This
>>> effectively means that an independent kernel limit is in place when the
>>> limit is set to a lower value than the user memory. A equal or higher
>>> value means that the user limit will always hit first, meaning that kmem
>>> is effectively unlimited.
>>>
>>> People who want to track kernel memory but not limit it, can set this
>>> limit to a very high number (like RESOURCE_MAX - 1page - that no one
>>> will ever hit, or equal to the user memory)
>>>
>>> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>
>>> CC: Michal Hocko <mhocko@suse.cz>
>>> CC: Johannes Weiner <hannes@cmpxchg.org>
>>> Reviewed-by: Kamezawa Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com>
>>
>> Could you add a patch for documentation of this new interface and a text
>> explaining the behavior of "kmem_accounting" ?
>>
>> Hm, my concern is the difference of behavior between user page accounting and
>> kmem accounting...but this is how tcp-accounting is working.
>>
>> Once you add Documentation, it's okay to add my Ack.
>>
> I plan to add documentation in a separate patch. Due to that, can I add
> your ack to this patch here?

>
> Also, I find that the description text in patch0 grew to be quite
> informative and complete. I plan to add that to the documentation
> if that is ok with you
>

Ack to this patch.

-Kame