Subject: Re: [PATCH] usbatm: Update to use the kthread api.
Posted by Alan Stern on Thu, 14 Dec 2006 16:05:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, 14 Dec 2006, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

> Actually I don't accept that a signal needs to be sent. I do accept
> that the message needs to be delivered to stop things early.
>
> The paradigm in a kthread world for waking up kernel threads is by
> calling kthread_stop, and then for testing if a kernel thread should
> stop is by calling kthread_should_stop.
>
> Especially if you are looking at generalizing this code over all of
> usb it should probably be using the current kernel best practices.
>
> There is still an issue with msleep here that I completely concede.
> In particular neither msleep nor msleep interruptible will actually be
> awoken by kthread_stop. So it looks like we need a msleep_kthread
> that will won't go back to sleep if after kthread_stop wakes it up.
> Still unless I am blind that looks like a very minor change from where
> we are now.

Something else to think about. I've got a driver that starts up a kernel thread which calls vfs_read() and vfs_write() and relies on signals to interrupt the I/O operations when necessary. Perhaps this approach is fundamentally wrong, but I'm not sure how else to do it.

Alan Stern

_____