
Subject: Re: [PATCH] usbarm: Update to use the kthread api.
Posted by [Christoph Hellwig](#) on Tue, 02 Jan 2007 11:11:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, Dec 15, 2006 at 10:14:06AM -0500, Alan Stern wrote:

> On Fri, 15 Dec 2006, Christoph Hellwig wrote:

>

> > > Are signals the best available mechanism to request that a thread

> > > stop that can exit on it's own.

> >

> > Defintly not. signals should be avoided in kernel threads at all

> > cost.

>

> I have a driver that spawns a kernel thread (using kthread_create) which

> does I/O by calling vfs_write and vfs_read. It relies on signals to

> interrupt the I/O activity when necessary. Maybe this isn't a good way of

> doing things, but I couldn't think of anything better.

Given that we have no other way to interrupt I/O then signals at those lower level I don't see a way around the singals if you stick to that higher level design.

> P.S.: What is the reason for saying "signals should be avoided in kernel threads at all cost"?

The problem with signals is that they can come from various sources, most notably from random kill commands issues from userland. This defeats the notion of a fixed thread lifetime under control of the owning module. Of course this issue doesn't exist for you above useage where you'd hopefully avoid allowing signals that could terminate the thread.

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
