

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] vt: Rework the console spawning variables.

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2006 02:40:29 GMT

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

---

Oleg Nesterov <[oleg@tv-sign.ru](mailto:oleg@tv-sign.ru)> writes:

> On 09/10, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

>>

>> Ok. I think I see the where the confusion is. We were looking

>> at different parts of the puzzle. But I we need to resolve this

>> to make certain I didn't do something clever and racy.

>

> Yes, I think we misunderstood each other :)

>

>> As for the rest of your suggestion it would not be hard to be able to

>> follow a struct pid pointer in an rcu safe way, and we do in the pid

>> hash table. In other contexts so far I always have other variables

>> that need to be updated in concert, so there isn't a point in coming

>> up with a lockless implementation. I believe vt\_pid is the only

>> case that I have run across where this is a problem and I have

>> at least preliminary patches for every place where signals are

>> sent.

>>

>> Updating this old code is painful.

>

> No, no, we shouldn't change the old code, it is fine.

>

So what happens when:

cpu0:                      cpu1:

kill\_pid(vt\_pid,...)      fn\_SAK()->vc\_reset()->put\_pid(xchg(&vt\_pid, NULL))

Can't kill\_pid dereference vt\_pid after put\_pid is called?

It's a microscopic window, and requires the user to attempt a vt switch  
and a sak simultaneously but I think it is there.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.osdl.org](mailto:Containers@lists.osdl.org)

<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---