
Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/7] introduce atomic_dec_and_lock_irqsave()

Posted by [Roman Zippel](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 17:25:07 GMT

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

Hi,

On Wed, 30 Aug 2006, Dipankar Sarma wrote:

> > > 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?

>

> No. You need protection only if you have are using some

> data that can also be used by the RCU callback. For example,

> if your RCU callback just calls kfree(), you don't have to

> do a spin_lock_bh().

In this case kfree() does its own interrupt synchronization. I didn't realize before that rcu had this (IMO serious) limitation. I think there should be two call_rcu() variants, one that queues the callback in a soft irq and a second which queues it in a thread context.

bye, Roman
