Subject: Re: [PATCH v4 12/14] execute the whole memcg freeing in free_worker Posted by Michal Hocko on Thu, 11 Oct 2012 14:21:27 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon 08-10-12 14:06:18, Glauber Costa wrote:

- > A lot of the initialization we do in mem_cgroup_create() is done with
- > softirqs enabled. This include grabbing a css id, which holds
- > &ss->id_lock->rlock, and the per-zone trees, which holds
- > rtpz->lock->rlock. All of those signal to the lockdep mechanism that
- > those locks can be used in SOFTIRQ-ON-W context. This means that the
- > freeing of memcg structure must happen in a compatible context,
- > otherwise we'll get a deadlock, like the one bellow, caught by lockdep:
- >
- > [<fffffff81103095>] free_accounted_pages+0x47/0x4c
- > [<fffffff81047f90>] free_task+0x31/0x5c
- > [<ffffff8104807d>] __put_task_struct+0xc2/0xdb
- > [<fffffff8104dfc7>] put_task_struct+0x1e/0x22
- > [<fffffff8104e144>] delayed_put_task_struct+0x7a/0x98
- > [<fffffff810cf0e5>] __rcu_process_callbacks+0x269/0x3df
- > [<fffffff810cf28c>] rcu_process_callbacks+0x31/0x5b
- > [<fffffff8105266d>] __do_softirq+0x122/0x277

>

- > This usage pattern could not be triggered before kmem came into play.
- > With the introduction of kmem stack handling, it is possible that we
- > call the last mem_cgroup_put() from the task destructor, which is run in
- > an rcu callback. Such callbacks are run with softirqs disabled, leading
- > to the offensive usage pattern.

>

- > In general, we have little, if any, means to guarantee in which context
- > the last memcg_put will happen. The best we can do is test it and try to
- > make sure no invalid context releases are happening. But as we add more
- > code to memcg, the possible interactions grow in number and expose more
- > ways to get context conflicts. One thing to keep in mind, is that part
- > of the freeing process is already deferred to a worker, such as vfree(),
- > that can only be called from process context.

>

- > For the moment, the only two functions we really need moved away are:
- > * free_css_id(), and
- > * mem_cgroup_remove_from_trees().

>

- > But because the later accesses per-zone info,
- > free_mem_cgroup_per_zone_info() needs to be moved as well. With that, we
- > are left with the per_cpu stats only. Better move it all.

>

- > Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>
- > Tested-by: Greg Thelen <gthelen@google.com>
- > CC: KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com>

- > CC: Michal Hocko <mhocko@suse.cz>
- > CC: Johannes Weiner <hannes@cmpxchg.org>
- > CC: Tejun Heo <tj@kernel.org>

OK, it seems it is much easier this way. Acked-by: Michal Hocko <mhocko@suse.cz>

> ----> 1 file changed, 34 insertions(+), 32 deletions(-) > > diff --git a/mm/memcontrol.c b/mm/memcontrol.c > index 2f92f89..c5215f1 100644 > --- a/mm/memcontrol.c > +++ b/mm/memcontrol.c > @ @ -5205,16 +5205,29 @ @ out_free: > } > > /* > - * Helpers for freeing a kmalloc()ed/vzalloc()ed mem_cgroup by RCU, > - * but in process context. The work_freeing structure is overlaid > - * on the rcu freeing structure, which itself is overlaid on memsw. > + * At destroying mem_cgroup, references from swap_cgroup can remain. > + * (scanning all at force_empty is too costly...) > + * > + * Instead of clearing all references at force_empty, we remember > + * the number of reference from swap_cgroup and free mem_cgroup when > + * it goes down to 0. > + * > + * Removal of cgroup itself succeeds regardless of refs from swap. */ > > -static void free_work(struct work_struct *work) > + > +static void ___mem_cgroup_free(struct mem_cgroup *memcg) > { > - struct mem_cgroup *memcg; > + int node; > int size = sizeof(struct mem_cgroup); > > - memcg = container of(work, struct mem cgroup, work freeing); > + mem cgroup remove from trees(memcg); > + free_css_id(&mem_cgroup_subsys, &memcg->css); > + > + for_each_node(node) > + free_mem_cgroup_per_zone_info(memcg, node); > + > + free percpu(memcq->stat); > +

```
/*
>
   * We need to make sure that (at least for now), the jump label
>
>
  * destruction code runs outside of the cgroup lock. This is because
> @ @ -5233,38 +5246,27 @ @ static void free_work(struct work_struct *work)
  vfree(memca);
>
> }
>
> -static void free_rcu(struct rcu_head *rcu_head)
> -{
> - struct mem cgroup *memcg;
> -
> - memcg = container of(rcu head, struct mem cgroup, rcu freeing);
> - INIT_WORK(&memcg->work_freeing, free_work);
> - schedule_work(&memcg->work_freeing);
> -}
>
> /*
> - * At destroying mem_cgroup, references from swap_cgroup can remain.
> - * (scanning all at force empty is too costly...)
> - *
> - * Instead of clearing all references at force_empty, we remember
> - * the number of reference from swap cgroup and free mem cgroup when
> - * it goes down to 0.
> - *
> - * Removal of cgroup itself succeeds regardless of refs from swap.
> + * Helpers for freeing a kmalloc()ed/vzalloc()ed mem_cgroup by RCU,
> + * but in process context. The work_freeing structure is overlaid
> + * on the rcu freeing structure, which itself is overlaid on memsw.
> */
> -
> -static void mem cgroup free(struct mem cgroup *memcg)
> +static void free work(struct work struct *work)
> {
> - int node;
> + struct mem_cgroup *memcg;
>
> - mem_cgroup_remove_from_trees(memcg);
> - free_css_id(&mem_cgroup_subsys, &memcg->css);
> + memcg = container_of(work, struct mem_cgroup, work_freeing);
> + mem cgroup free(memcg);
> +}
>
> - for_each_node(node)
> - free_mem_cgroup_per_zone_info(memcg, node);
> +static void free rcu(struct rcu head *rcu head)
> +{
> + struct mem cgroup *memcg;
>
```

```
> - free_percpu(memcg->stat);
> - call_rcu(&memcg->rcu_freeing, free_rcu);
> + memcg = container_of(rcu_head, struct mem_cgroup, rcu_freeing);
> + INIT_WORK(&memcg->work_freeing, free_work);
> + schedule_work(&memcg->work_freeing);
> }
>
> static void mem_cgroup_get(struct mem_cgroup *memcg)
> @ @ -5276,7 +5278,7 @ @ static void mem cgroup put(struct mem cgroup *memcg, int
count)
> {
> if (atomic sub and test(count, &memcg->refcnt)) {
> struct mem_cgroup *parent = parent_mem_cgroup(memcg);
> - ___mem_cgroup_free(memcg);
> + call_rcu(&memcg->rcu_freeing, free_rcu);
>
  if (parent)
   mem_cgroup_put(parent);
>
> }
> --
> 1.7.11.4
>
> --
> To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe cgroups" in
> the body of a message to majordomo@vger.kernel.org
> More majordomo info at http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html
```

Michal Hocko SUSE Labs

Page 4 of 4 ---- Generated from OpenVZ Forum