

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/7] introduce atomic\_dec\_and\_lock\_irqsave()

Posted by [Oleg Nesterov](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 11:27:53 GMT

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

---

On 08/30, Roman Zippel wrote:

> Hi,

>

> On Wed, 30 Aug 2006, Oleg Nesterov wrote:

>

> > > Why does this need protection against interrupts?

> >

> > uidhash\_lock can be taken from irq context. For example, delayed\_put\_task\_struct()

> > does \_\_put\_task\_struct()->free\_uid().

>

> > AFAICT it's called via rcu, does that mean anything released via rcu has

> to be protected against interrupts?

RCU means softirq, probably we can use spin\_lock\_bh() to protect against deadlock.

But free\_uid() may be called with irqs disabled, we can't use local\_bh\_enable()

in such a case.

Oleg.

---