
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.
