

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 04/13] kmem accounting basic infrastructure

Posted by [Tejun Heo](#) on Wed, 03 Oct 2012 22:59:30 GMT

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

---

Hello, Glauber.

On Mon, Oct 01, 2012 at 12:46:02PM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:

> > Yeah, it will need some hooks. For dentry and inode, I think it would

> > be pretty well isolated tho. Wasn't it?

>

> We would still need something for the stack. For open files, and for

> everything that becomes a potential problem. We then end up with 35

> different knobs instead of one. One of the perceived advantages of this

> approach, is that it condenses as much data as a single knob as

> possible, reducing complexity and over flexibility.

Oh, I didn't mean to use object-specific counting for all of them.

Most resources don't have such common misaccounting problem. I mean,

for stack, it doesn't exist by definition (other than cgroup

migration). There's no reason to use anything other than first-use

kmem based accounting for them. My point was that for particularly

problematic ones like dentry/inode, it might be better to treat them

differently.

Thanks.

--

tejun

---