## Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 04/13] kmem accounting basic infrastructure Posted by Glauber Costa on Wed, 26 Sep 2012 17:34:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On 09/26/2012 08:01 PM, Michal Hocko wrote:
> On Wed 26-09-12 18:33:10, Glauber Costa wrote:
>> On 09/26/2012 06:03 PM, Michal Hocko wrote:
>>> On Tue 18-09-12 18:04:01, Glauber Costa wrote:
> [...]
>>>> @@ -4961,6 +5015,12 @@ mem_cgroup_create(struct cgroup *cont)
>>>>
      int cpu;
       enable swap cgroup();
>>>>
      parent = NULL;
>>>>
>>>> +
>>> +#ifdef CONFIG_MEMCG_KMEM
>>> + WARN_ON(cgroup_add_cftypes(&mem_cgroup_subsys,
           kmem cgroup files));
>>>> +
>>>> +#endif
>>>> +
>>>> if (mem_cgroup_soft_limit_tree_init())
>>>>
       goto free out;
>>> root_mem_cgroup = memcg;
>>>> @ @ -4979,6 +5039,7 @ @ mem_cgroup_create(struct cgroup *cont)
>>> if (parent && parent->use_hierarchy) {
>>> res_counter_init(&memcg->res, &parent->res);
>>> res counter init(&memcg->memsw, &parent->memsw);
>>> + res_counter_init(&memcg->kmem, &parent->kmem);
>>>
>>> Haven't we already discussed that a new memog should inherit kmem accounted
>>> from its parent for use hierarchy?
>>> Sav we have
>>> root
>>> |
>>> A (kmem_accounted = 1, use_hierachy = 1)
>>> \
>>> B (kmem accounted = 0)
>>>
      C (kmem accounted = 1)
>>>
>>> B find's itself in an awkward situation because it doesn't want to
>>> account u+k but it ends up doing so becuase C.
>>>
>>
>> Ok, I haven't updated it here. But that should be taken care of in the
>> lifecycle patch.
> I am not sure which patch you are thinking about but I would prefer to
> have it here because it is safe wrt, races and it is more obvious as
```

> well.

>

The patch where I make kmem\_accounted into a bitfield. So any code here will eventually disappear.

But BTW, I am not saying I won't update the patch - I like that all patches work and make sense in their own, I am just saying that I forgot to update this patch, because I added the code in its final version to the end and then squashed it.