
Subject: Re: [RFC][only for review] memory controller bacground reclaim [4/5]
high/low watermark for memory

Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Sat, 01 Dec 2007 07:09:20 GMT

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

On Nov 28, 2007 12:56 AM, KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki

<kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com> wrote:

```
> {
> +     .name = "low_watermark_in_bytes",
> +     .private = RES_LOW_WATERMARK,
> +     .write = mem_cgroup_write,
> +     .read = mem_cgroup_read,
> + },
> + {
> +     .name = "high_watermark_in_bytes",
> +     .private = RES_HIGH_WATERMARK,
> +     .write = mem_cgroup_write,
> +     .read = mem_cgroup_read,
> + },
```

>From a style point of view, I dislike having the "in_bytes" suffix
tacked on to all the memory controller filenames.

If people really want this to be self-documenting, how about we allow
cgroup control files to specify metadata, which would be presented to
the user via an auto-generated "api" file.

As an example, the addition above might then look something like:

```
{
    .name = "low_watermark",
    .units = "bytes",
    .description = "usage below which background reclaim stops",
    .write = mem_cgroup_write,
    .read = mem_cgroup_read,
}
```

which would correspond to a line in the "mem.api" auto-generated control file as

low_watermark: usage below which background reclaim stops (bytes)

Paul

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
