

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] remove BUG() in possible but rare condition  
Posted by [Michal Hocko](#) on Wed, 11 Apr 2012 21:26:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed 11-04-12 14:12:44, Andrew Morton wrote:  
> On Wed, 11 Apr 2012 17:51:57 -0300  
> Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com> wrote:  
>  
> > On 04/11/2012 05:26 PM, Andrew Morton wrote:  
> > >  
> > > > failed:  
> > > > - BUG();  
> > > > unlock\_page(page);  
> > > > page\_cache\_release(page);  
> > > > return NULL;  
> > > Cute.  
> > >  
> > > AFAICT what happened was that in my April 2002 rewrite of this code I  
> > > put a non-fatal buffer\_error() warning in that case to tell us that  
> > > something bad happened.  
> > >  
> > > Years later we removed the temporary buffer\_error() and mistakenly  
> > > replaced that warning with a BUG(). Only it\*can\* happen.  
> > >  
> > > We can remove the BUG() and fix up callers, or we can pass retry=1 into  
> > > alloc\_page\_buffers(), so grow\_dev\_page() "cannot fail". Immortal  
> > > functions are a silly fiction, so we should remove the BUG() and fix up  
> > > callers.  
> > >  
> > Any particular caller you are concerned with ?  
>  
> Didn't someone see a buggy caller in btrfs?

No I missed that \_\_getblk (\_\_getblk\_slow) returns NULL only if  
grow\_buffers < 0 while it returns 0 for the allocation failure.

Sorry for confusion.

--

Michal Hocko  
SUSE Labs  
SUSE LINUX s.r.o.  
Lihovarska 1060/12  
190 00 Praha 9  
Czech Republic

---