Subject: Re: [Q] missing unused dentry in prune_dcache()?
Posted by David Howells on Wed, 25 Oct 2006 13:51:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Vasily Averin <vvs@sw.ru> wrote:

> # If prune_dcache finds a dentry that it cannot free, it leaves it where it
> # is (at the tail of the list) and exits, on the assumption that some other
> # thread will be removing that dentry soon.
>
> However as far as I see this comment is not correct: when we cannot take
> s_umount rw_semaphore (for example because it was taken in do_remount) this
> dentry is already extracted from dentry_unused list and we do not add it into
> the list again.

You would seem to be correct.

> Therefore dentry will not be found by prune_dcache() and shrink_dcache_sb()
> and will leave in memory very long time until the partition will be
> unmounted.

And here too:-/

> Am I probably err?

Unfortunately not. I wonder if remount should be getting a writelock on the s_umount sem, but I don't see why not. grab_super() also gets a writelock on it, and so that could cause problems too.

shrink_dcache_for_umount_subtree() doesn't care because it doesn't scan the dcache_unused list, but as you say, other things are affected.

> The patch adds this dentry into tail of the dentry_unused list.

I think that's reasonable. I wonder if we can avoid removing it from the list in the first place, but I suspect it's less optimal.

Acked-By: David Howells <dhowells@redhat.com>