Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/4] sysfs: Implement sysfs manged shadow directory support.
Posted by ebiederm on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 03:24:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Ugh. I need to step back and carefully define what I'm seeing but it looks like the current sysfs locking is wrong.

I'm starting to find little inconsistencies all over the place such as:

Which lock actually protects sd->s_children?
- It isn't sysfs_mutex. (see sysfs_lookup)
- It isn't inode->i_mutex (we only get it if we happen to have the inode in core)

At first glance sysfs_assoc_lock looks just as bad.

Eric