

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/7] containers (V7): Generic container system abstracted from cpusets code

Posted by [Srivatsa Vaddagiri](#) on Tue, 13 Feb 2007 05:48:57 GMT

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

---

On Mon, Feb 12, 2007 at 11:46:20AM -0800, Paul Menage wrote:

> On further reflection, this probably would be safe after all. Since we  
> don't call put\_container\_group() in attach\_task() until after  
> synchronize\_rcu() completes, that implies that a container\_group\_get()  
> from the RCU section would have already completed. So we should be  
> fine.

Right.

Which make me wonder why we need task\_lock() at all ..I can understand the need for a lock like that if we are reading/updating multiple words in task\_struct under the lock. In this case, it is used to read/write just one pointer, isn't it? I think it can be eliminated all-together with the use of RCU.

--

Regards,  
vatsa

---