

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 05/13] Add a \_\_GFP\_KMEMCG flag  
Posted by [Christoph Lameter](#) on Wed, 19 Sep 2012 14:07:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed, 19 Sep 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:

```
> On 09/18/2012 07:06 PM, Christoph Lameter wrote:
> > On Tue, 18 Sep 2012, Glauber Costa wrote:
> >
> > +++ b/include/linux/gfp.h
> > @@ -35,6 +35,11 @@ struct vm_area_struct;
> > #else
> > #define __GFP_NOTRACK 0
> > #endif
> > +#ifdef CONFIG_MEMCG_KMEM
> > +#define __GFP_KMEMCG 0x400000u
> > +#else
> > +#define __GFP_KMEMCG 0
> > +#endif
> >
> > Could you leave __GFP_MEMCG a simple definition and then define GFP_MEMCG
> > to be zero if !MEMCG_KMEM? I think that would be cleaner and the
> > __GFP_KMEMCHECK another case that would be good to fix up.
> >
> >
> >
> I can, but what does this buy us?
```

All the numeric values should be defined with \_\_ unconditionally so that they can be used in future context. Note the comment above the \_\_GFP\_XX which says "Do not use this directly".

> Also, in any case, this can be done incrementally, and for the other  
> flag as well, as you describe.

There is only one other flag that does not follow the scheme. I'd appreciate it if you could submit a patch to fix up the \_\_GFP\_NOTRACK conditional there.

There is no need to do this incrementally. Do it the right way immediately.

---