

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH v2 3/5] change number\_of\_cpusets to an atomic  
Posted by [KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki](#) on Tue, 24 Apr 2012 02:25:46 GMT

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

---

(2012/04/24 4:37), Glauber Costa wrote:

> This will allow us to call destroy() without holding the  
> cgroup\_mutex(). Other important updates inside update\_flags()  
> are protected by the callback\_mutex.  
>  
> We could protect this variable with the callback\_mutex as well,  
> as suggested by Li Zefan, but we need to make sure we are protected  
> by that mutex at all times, and some of its updates happen inside the  
> cgroup\_mutex - which means we would deadlock.  
>  
> An atomic variable is not expensive, since it is seldom updated,  
> and protect us well.  
>  
> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>

Reviewed-by: KAMEZAWA Hiroyuki <kamezawa.hiroyu@jp.fujitsu.com>

---