

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] kthread: saa7134-tvaudio.c  
Posted by [Andrew Morton](#) on Wed, 30 Aug 2006 16:49:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Wed, 30 Aug 2006 18:30:27 +0200  
Cedric Le Goater <clg@fr.ibm.com> wrote:

> Andrew Morton wrote:  
> > On Tue, 29 Aug 2006 14:15:55 -0700  
> > Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com> wrote:  
> >  
> >> Replace kernel\_thread() with kthread\_run() since kernel\_thread()  
> >> is deprecated in drivers/modules.  
> >>  
> >> Note that this driver, like a few others, allows SIGTERM. Not  
> >> sure if that is affected by conversion to kthread. Appreciate  
> >> any comments on that.  
> >>  
> >  
> > hm, I think this driver needs more help.  
> >  
> > - It shouldn't be using signals at all, really. Signals are for  
> > userspace IPC. The kernel internally has better/richer/faster/tighter  
> > ways of inter-thread communication.  
> >  
> > - saa7134\_tvaudio\_fini()-versus-tvaudio\_sleep() looks racy:  
> >  
> > if (dev->thread.scan1 == dev->thread.scan2 && !dev->thread.shutdown) {  
> > if (timeout < 0) {  
> > set\_current\_state(TASK\_INTERRUPTIBLE);  
> > schedule();  
> >  
> > If the wakeup happens after the test of dev->thread.shutdown, that sleep will  
> > be permanent.  
> >  
> >  
> > So in general, yes, the driver should be converted to the kthread API -  
> > this is a requirement for virtualisation, but I forget why, and that's the  
> > "standard" way of doing it.  
> >  
> > - The signal stuff should go away if at all possible.  
>  
> The thread of this driver allows SIGTERM for some obscure reason. Not sure  
> why, I didn't find anything relying on it.  
>  
> could we just remove the allow\_signal() ?  
>

I hope so. However I have a bad feeling that the driver wants to accept signals from userspace. Hopefully Mauro & co will be able to clue us in.

---

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.osdl.org

<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---