

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 9/13] BC: locked pages (charge hooks)  
Posted by [Nick Piggin](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 09:41:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pavel Emelianov wrote:

>Nick Piggin wrote:

>

>>Kirill Korotaev wrote:

>>

>>

>>>Introduce calls to BC core over the kernel to charge locked memory.

>>>

>>>Normaly new locked piece of memory may appear in insert\_vm\_struct,

>>>but there are places (do\_mmap\_pgoff, dup\_mmap etc) when new vma

>>>is not inserted by insert\_vm\_struct(), but either link\_vma-ed or

>>>merged with some other - these places call BC code explicitly.

>>>

>>>Plus sys\_mlock[all] itself has to be patched to charge/uncharge

>>>needed amount of pages.

>>>

>>

>>I still haven't heard your good reasons why such a complex scheme is

>>required when my really simple proposal of unconditionally charging

>>the page to the container it was allocated by.

>>

>Charging the page to the container it was allocated in is a possible and

>correct way, we agree, but how does this comment refer to locked pages

>

If it is a possible and correct way, I'd must rather see *\*that\** way  
get tried first, and then made more complex or discarded if it is  
found to be insufficient.

>accounting?

>

That's where I'd looked at enough mm/ stuff to decide that it wasn't  
just my usual unjustified whining. Complexity of this approach is  
quite... high.

Sorry if that wasn't clear.

--

Send instant messages to your online friends <http://au.messenger.yahoo.com>

---