

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] usbatm: Update to use the kthread api.

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 03 Jan 2007 09:05:28 GMT

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

---

Alan Stern <[stern@rowland.harvard.edu](mailto:stern@rowland.harvard.edu)> writes:

> On Tue, 2 Jan 2007, Christoph Hellwig wrote:

>

>> > I have a driver that spawns a kernel thread (using kthread\_create) which  
>> > does I/O by calling vfs\_write and vfs\_read. It relies on signals to  
>> > interrupt the I/O activity when necessary. Maybe this isn't a good way of  
>> > doing things, but I couldn't think of anything better.

>>

>> Given that we have no other way to interrupt I/O then signals at those  
>> lower level I don't see a way around the singals if you stick to that  
>> higher level design.

>

> Okay.

>

>> > P.S.: What is the reason for saying "signals should be avoided in kernel  
>> > threads at all cost"?

>>

>> The problem with signals is that they can come from various sources, most  
>> notably from random kill commands issues from userland. This defeats  
>> the notion of a fixed thread lifetime under control of the owning module.  
>> Of course this issue doesn't exist for you above useage where you'd  
>> hopefully avoid allowing signals that could terminate the thread.

>

> In my case the situation is exactly the reverse: I \_want\_ to allow signals  
> to terminate the thread (as well as allowing signals to interrupt I/O).

>

> The reason is simple enough. At system shutdown, if the thread isn't  
> terminated then it would continue to own an open file, preventing that  
> file's filesystem from being unmounted cleanly. Since people should be  
> able to unmount their disks during shutdown without having to unload  
> drivers first, the simplest solution is to allow the thread to respond to  
> the TERM signal normally sent by the shutdown scripts.

>

> Since the thread is owned by the kernel, random kill commands won't have  
> any bad effect. Only kill commands sent by the superuser can terminate  
> the thread.

>

Why in the world would a thread hold a file open for an indeterminate duration?  
That seems very wrong.

I can just about understand reading a firmware file or something like that  
and close the file afterwards. But unless you are worrying about a very small

window I think we have a problem here.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.osdl.org

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

---