Subject: Re: [PATCH] usbatm: Update to use the kthread api. Posted by ebiederm on Wed, 03 Jan 2007 09:08:12 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Christoph Hellwig <hch@infradead.org> writes:

- > 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.

It isn't hard to either modify signal\_pending or the place where the signal pending checks are to terminate things.

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

Right unless you can get a state where user space is not allowed to send signals but the kernel is. But still reusing the concept if it doesn't quite fit sounds like a definition mess.

Eric

>

Containers mailing list Containers@lists.osdl.org https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers