

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 12/15] driver core: Implement tagged directory support for device classes.

Posted by [Tejun Heo](#) on Wed, 16 Jul 2008 07:02:36 GMT

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

---

Tejun Heo wrote:

> Hello, Eric.

>

> Eric W. Biederman wrote:

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

>>

>>> It's a bit scary tho. Working inode->i\_dentry or dentry->d\_alias

>>> crosses multiple sb's. sysfs isn't too greedy about dcache/icache.

>>> Only open files and directories hold them and only single copy of

>>> sysfs\_dirent is there for most nodes. Wouldn't it be better to stay on

>>> the safer side and use separate inode hierarchy?

>> To do that I believe we would need to ensure sysfs does not use

>> the inode->i\_mutex lock except to keep the VFS layer out. Allowing us

>> to safely change the directory structure, without holding it.

>

> I don't think sysfs is depending on i\_mutex anymore but I need to go

> through the code to make sure.

>

>> You raise a good point about inode->i\_dentry and dentry->d\_alias.

>> Generally they are used by fat like filesystems but I am starting to

>> see uses in generic pieces of code. I don't see any problems today

>> but yes it would be good to do the refactoring to allow us to duplicate

>> the inodes.

>

> Yeah, I can't spot any place which can cause actual problem yet but it's

> still scary as we're breaking a vfs assumption and even if it's not a

> problem now, future seemingly unrelated changes can break things subtly.

Okay, one small problem spotted. It seems `invalidate_inodes()` can fail which will make `generic_shutdown_super()` complain. It's not a fatal failure tho.

--

tejun

---

Containers mailing list

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

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

---