
Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 06/16] memcg: infrastructure to match an allocation to the right cache

Posted by [Tejun Heo](#) on Mon, 24 Sep 2012 17:56:19 GMT

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

Hello, Glauber.

On Mon, Sep 24, 2012 at 12:46:35PM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:

```
> > + #ifdef CONFIG_MEMCG_KMEM
> > + /* Slab accounting */
> > + struct kmem_cache *slabs[MAX_KMEM_CACHE_TYPES];
> > + #endif
> >
> > Bah, 400 entry array in struct mem_cgroup. Can't we do something a
> > bit more flexible?
> >
> >
> > I guess. I still would like it to be an array, so we can easily access
> > its fields. There are two ways around this:
> >
> > 1) Do like the events mechanism and allocate this in a separate
> > structure. Add a pointer chase in the access, and I don't think it helps
> > much because it gets allocated anyway. But we could at least
> > defer it to the time when we limit the cache.
```

Start at some reasonable size and then double it as usage grows? How many kmem_caches do we typically end up using?

```
> > + if (memcg->slabs[idx] == NULL) {
> > + memcg_create_cache_enqueue(memcg, cachep);
> >
> > Do we want to wait for the work item if @gfp allows?
> >
> >
> > I tried this once, and it got complicated enough that I deemed as "not
> > worth it". I honestly don't remember much of the details now, it was one
> > of the first things I tried, and a bunch of time has passed. If you
> > think it is absolutely worth it, I can try it again. But at the very
> > best, I view this as an optimization.
```

I don't know. It seems like a logical thing to try and depends on how complex it gets. I don't think it's a must. The whole thing is somewhat opportunistic after all.

Thanks.

--
tejun
