

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 20/25] sysfs: Rename Support multiple superblocks

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 08 Aug 2007 16:55:10 GMT

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

---

Tejun Heo <[htejun@gmail.com](mailto:htejun@gmail.com)> writes:

> Eric W. Biederman wrote:

```
>>> /* Find the first parent which has valid dentry.
```

```
>>> */
```

```
>>> dentry = NULL;
```

```
>>> cur = sd;
```

```
>>> while (!(dentry = __sysfs_get_dentry(sb, cur))) {
```

```
>>> if (cur->s_flags & SYSFS_FLAG_REMOVED) {
```

```
>>>     dentry = ERR_PTR(-ENOENT);
```

```
>>>     break;
```

```
>>> }
```

```
>>> cur = cur->s_parent;
```

```
>>> }
```

```
>>
```

>> Here we depend on the fact that sysfs\_root is pointed to

>> by sb->s\_root so we know it will always have a dentry.

>

> Hmmm... dentry could be ERR\_PTR(-ENOENT) here if the REMOVED flag test

> succeeded, right?

Ugh right. Now that I don't have the locking it probably makes sense to have that path just return or branch to the exit.

>

```
>>> /* from the found dentry, look up depth times */
```

```
>>> while (dentry->d_fsdata != sd) {
```

```
>
```

> And then dereferenced. The REMOVED test should never succeed there, so

> we're probably in the clear but still the code looks a bit scary.

Agreed. That is a bug. Either the removed test needs to be removed because it can't happen or that case needs to be handled.

Thanks for spotting this one.

Mental blind spots are the worst.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---