Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/4] sysfs: Implement sysfs manged shadow directory support.
Posted by Tejun Heo on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 03:41:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,

Eric W. Biederman wrote:
> 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)

Yeah, I missed two places while converting to sysfs_mutex.
sysfs_lookup() and rename(). I'm about to post patch to fix it.

> At first glance sysfs_assoc_lock looks just as bad.

I think sysfs_assoc_lock is okay. It's tricky tho. Why do you think
it's bad?

--
tejun

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers