Subject: Re: [PATCH v5 2/2] decrement static keys on real destroy time Posted by akpm on Thu, 17 May 2012 05:37:15 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, 17 May 2012 07:06:52 +0400 Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com> wrote:

```
> ...
>>> + else if (val != RESOURCE_MAX) {
>>> + /*
>>> + *->activated needs to be written after the static key update.
>>> + * This is what guarantees that the socket activation function
>>> + * is the last one to run. See sock update memcg() for details,
       * and note that we don't mark any socket as belonging to this
>>> + * memcg until that flag is up.
> >> +
>>> + * We need to do this, because static_keys will span multiple
>>> + * sites, but we can't control their order. If we mark a socket
          as accounted, but the accounting functions are not patched in
>>> + * yet, we'll lose accounting.
>>> + * We never race with the readers in sock update memcg(), because
>>> + * when this value change, the code to process it is not patched in
>>> + * vet.
>>> + */
>>> + if (!cg_proto->activated) {
>>> + static_key_slow_inc(&memcg_socket_limit_enabled);
>>> + cg_proto->activated = true;
>>>+ }
> >
>> If two threads run this code concurrently, they can both see
>> cq proto->activated==false and they will both run
> > static_key_slow_inc().
> >
> > Hopefully there's some locking somewhere which prevents this, but it is
> > unobvious. We should comment this, probably at the cg_proto.activated
> > definition site. Or we should fix the bug ;)
> If that happens, locking in static key slow inc will prevent any damage.
> My previous version had explicit code to prevent that, but we were
> pointed out that this is already part of the static key expectations, so
> that was dropped.
```

This makes no sense. If two threads run that code concurrently, key->enabled gets incremented twice. Nobody anywhere has a record that this happened so it cannot be undone. key->enabled is now in an unknown state.