## Subject: Re: [PATCH v4 02/11] memcg: document cgroup dirty memory interfaces Posted by Wu Fengguang on Fri, 29 Oct 2010 11:03:31 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Greg,

On Fri, Oct 29, 2010 at 03:09:05PM +0800, Greg Thelen wrote:

- > Document cgroup dirty memory interfaces and statistics.
- >
- > Signed-off-by: Andrea Righi <arighi@develer.com>
- > Signed-off-by: Greg Thelen <gthelen@google.com>
- > ---
- > +Limiting dirty memory is like fixing the max amount of dirty (hard to reclaim)
- > +page cache used by a cgroup. So, in case of multiple cgroup writers, they will
- > +not be able to consume more than their designated share of dirty pages and will
- > +be forced to perform write-out if they cross that limit.

It's more pertinent to say "will be throttled", as "perform write-out" is some implementation behavior that will change soon.

- > +- memory.dirty\_limit\_in\_bytes: the amount of dirty memory (expressed in bytes)
- > + in the cgroup at which a process generating dirty pages will start itself
- > + writing out dirty data. Suffix (k, K, m, M, g, or G) can be used to indicate
- > + that value is kilo, mega or gigabytes.

The suffix feature is handy, thanks! It makes sense to also add this for the global interfaces, perhaps in a standalone patch.

- > +A cgroup may contain more dirty memory than its dirty limit. This is possible
- > +because of the principle that the first cgroup to touch a page is charged for
- > +it. Subsequent page counting events (dirty, writeback, nfs\_unstable) are also
- > +counted to the originally charged cgroup.
- > +
- > +Example: If page is allocated by a cgroup A task, then the page is charged to
- > +cgroup A. If the page is later dirtied by a task in cgroup B, then the cgroup A
- > +dirty count will be incremented. If cgroup A is over its dirty limit but cgroup
- > +B is not, then dirtying a cgroup A page from a cgroup B task may push cgroup A
- > +over its dirty limit without throttling the dirtying cgroup B task.

It's good to document the above "misbehavior". But why not throttling the dirtying cgroup B task? Is it simply not implemented or makes no sense to do so at all?

Thanks, Fengguang

## Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containe rs