
Subject: Re: [RFC] [PATCH] cgroup: add "procs" control file
Posted by [Paul Menage](#) on Fri, 20 Jun 2008 05:37:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Wed, Jun 18, 2008 at 1:02 AM, Li Zefan <lizf@cn.fujitsu.com> wrote:
> - What to do if the attaching of a thread failed? continue to attach
> other threads, or stop and return error?

I think this is something that will have to be handled in the design
of transactional cgroup attach.

> - When a sub-thread of a process is in the cgroup, but not its thread
> cgroup leader, what to do when 'cat procs'? just skip those threads?

Sounds reasonable. I think that in general the procs file is more
useful as a write API than a read API anyway, for the reasons you
indicate there.

```
> +   tsk = attach_get_task(cgrp, pidbuf);  
> +   if (IS_ERR(tsk))  
> +       return PTR_ERR(tsk);  
> +  
> +   /* attach thread group leader */
```

Should we check that this is in fact a thread group leader?

```
> +  
> +   /* attach all sub-threads */  
> +   rcu_read_lock();
```

cgroup_attach_task() calls synchronize_rcu(), so it doesn't seem
likely that rcu_read_lock() is useful here, and might even deadlock?

What are you trying to protect against with the RCU lock?

```
>   {  
> +       .name = "procs",
```

Maybe call it "cgroup.procs" to avoid name clashes in future? We had a
debate a while back where I tried to get the cgroup files like "tasks"
and "notify_on_release" prefixed with "cgroup.", which were argued
against on grounds of backwards compatibility. But there's no
compatibility issue here. The only question is whether it's too ugly
to have the legacy filenames without a prefix and the new ones with a
prefix.

Paul

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