Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/7] introduce atomic_dec_and_lock_irqsave()
Posted by Oleg Nesterov on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 11:27:53 GMT

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.