Subject: [PATCH v3 02/13] memcg: Reclaim when more than one page needed. Posted by Glauber Costa on Tue, 18 Sep 2012 14:03:59 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

From: Suleiman Souhlal <ssouhlal@FreeBSD.org>

mem_cgroup_do_charge() was written before kmem accounting, and expects three cases: being called for 1 page, being called for a stock of 32 pages, or being called for a hugepage. If we call for 2 or 3 pages (and both the stack and several slabs used in process creation are such, at least with the debug options I had), it assumed it's being called for stock and just retried without reclaiming.

Fix that by passing down a minsize argument in addition to the csize.

And what to do about that (csize == PAGE_SIZE && ret) retry? If it's needed at all (and presumably is since it's there, perhaps to handle races), then it should be extended to more than PAGE_SIZE, yet how far? And should there be a retry count limit, of what? For now retry up to COSTLY_ORDER (as page_alloc.c does) and make sure not to do it if __GFP_NORETRY.

[v4: fixed nr pages calculation pointed out by Christoph Lameter]

```
Signed-off-by: Suleiman Souhlal <suleiman@google.com>
Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>
Reviewed-by: Kamezawa Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com>
Acked-by: Michal Hocko <mhocko@suse.cz>
```

mm/memcontrol.c | 16 +++++++++-----1 file changed, 9 insertions(+), 7 deletions(-)

```
diff --git a/mm/memcontrol.c b/mm/memcontrol.c
index 9d3bc72..b12121b 100644
--- a/mm/memcontrol.c
+++ b/mm/memcontrol.c
@ @ -2232,7 +2232,8 @ @ enum {
};
```

static int mem_cgroup_do_charge(struct mem_cgroup *memcg, gfp_t gfp_mask,

- unsigned int nr_pages, bool oom_check)
- + unsigned int nr_pages, unsigned int min_pages,
- + bool oom_check)

{

```
unsigned long csize = nr_pages * PAGE_SIZE;
```

struct mem_cgroup *mem_over_limit;

@ @ -2255,18 +2256,18 @ @ static int mem_cgroup_do_charge(struct mem_cgroup *memcg, gfp_t gfp_mask,

} else mem over limit = mem cgroup from res counter(fail res, res); /* - * nr_pages can be either a huge page (HPAGE_PMD_NR), a batch - * of regular pages (CHARGE_BATCH), or a single regular page (1). * Never reclaim on behalf of optional batching, retry with a * single page instead. */ - if (nr pages == CHARGE BATCH) + if (nr_pages > min_pages) return CHARGE RETRY; if (!(gfp_mask & __GFP_WAIT)) return CHARGE_WOULDBLOCK; + if (gfp_mask & __GFP_NORETRY) + return CHARGE NOMEM; + ret = mem_cgroup_reclaim(mem_over_limit, gfp_mask, flags); if (mem cgroup margin(mem over limit) >= nr pages) return CHARGE RETRY; @ @ -2279,7 +2280,7 @ @ static int mem_cgroup_do_charge(struct mem_cgroup *memcg, gfp_t dfp mask. * unlikely to succeed so close to the limit, and we fall back * to regular pages anyway in case of failure. */ - if (nr pages == 1 && ret) + if (nr pages <= (1 << PAGE ALLOC COSTLY ORDER) && ret) return CHARGE RETRY; /* @ @ -2414,7 +2415,8 @ @ again: nr_oom_retries = MEM_CGROUP_RECLAIM_RETRIES; } - ret = mem_cgroup_do_charge(memcg, gfp_mask, batch, oom_check); + ret = mem cgroup do charge(memcg, gfp mask, batch, nr pages, oom check); + switch (ret) { case CHARGE OK: break:

1.7.11.4

Subject: Re: [PATCH v3 02/13] memcg: Reclaim when more than one page

needed.

Posted by Johannes Weiner on Mon, 01 Oct 2012 19:00:48 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Tue, Sep 18, 2012 at 06:03:59PM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote: > From: Suleiman Souhlal <ssouhlal@FreeBSD.org>

> mem_cgroup_do_charge() was written before kmem accounting, and expects

> three cases: being called for 1 page, being called for a stock of 32

> pages, or being called for a hugepage. If we call for 2 or 3 pages (and

> both the stack and several slabs used in process creation are such, at

> least with the debug options I had), it assumed it's being called for

> stock and just retried without reclaiming.

>

> Fix that by passing down a minsize argument in addition to the csize.
 >

> And what to do about that (csize == PAGE_SIZE && ret) retry? If it's

Wow, that patch set has been around for a while. It's been nr_pages == 1 for a while now :-)

> needed at all (and presumably is since it's there, perhaps to handle

> races), then it should be extended to more than PAGE_SIZE, yet how far?

> And should there be a retry count limit, of what? For now retry up to

> COSTLY_ORDER (as page_alloc.c does) and make sure not to do it if

> ___GFP_NORETRY.

>

> [v4: fixed nr pages calculation pointed out by Christoph Lameter]

> Signed-off-by: Suleiman Souhlal <suleiman@google.com>

> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>

> Reviewed-by: Kamezawa Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com>

> Acked-by: Michal Hocko <mhocko@suse.cz>

> ----

> mm/memcontrol.c | 16 ++++++++++------

> 1 file changed, 9 insertions(+), 7 deletions(-)

>

> diff --git a/mm/memcontrol.c b/mm/memcontrol.c

> index 9d3bc72..b12121b 100644

> --- a/mm/memcontrol.c

> +++ b/mm/memcontrol.c

> @ @ -2232,7 +2232,8 @ @ enum {

> };

>

> static int mem_cgroup_do_charge(struct mem_cgroup *memcg, gfp_t gfp_mask,

> - unsigned int nr_pages, bool oom_check)

> + unsigned int nr_pages, unsigned int min_pages,

> + bool oom_check)

I'm not a big fan of the parameter names. Can we make this function officially aware of batching and name the parameters like the arguments that are passed in? I.e. @batch and @nr_pages?

```
> {
```

- > unsigned long csize = nr_pages * PAGE_SIZE;
- > struct mem_cgroup *mem_over_limit;

> @ @ -2255,18 +2256,18 @ @ static int mem_cgroup_do_charge(struct mem_cgroup *memcg, gfp_t gfp_mask,

- > } else
- > mem_over_limit = mem_cgroup_from_res_counter(fail_res, res);
- > /*

> - * nr_pages can be either a huge page (HPAGE_PMD_NR), a batch

> - * of regular pages (CHARGE_BATCH), or a single regular page (1).

> - *

- > * Never reclaim on behalf of optional batching, retry with a
- > * single page instead.

"[...] with the amount of actually required pages instead."

> */

- > if (nr_pages == CHARGE_BATCH)
- > + if (nr_pages > min_pages)
- > return CHARGE_RETRY;

if (batch > nr_pages) return CHARGE_RETRY;

But that is all just nitpicking. Functionally, it looks sane, so:

Acked-by: Johannes Weiner <hannes@cmpxchg.org>

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