

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] usbarm: Update to use the kthread api.

Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 03 Jan 2007 09:08:12 GMT

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

---

Christoph Hellwig <[hch@infradead.org](mailto:hch@infradead.org)> writes:

> 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.

It isn't hard to either modify signal\_pending or the place where the  
signal pending checks are to terminate things.

>> 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.

Right unless you can get a state where user space is not allowed to send  
signals but the kernel is. But still reusing the concept if it doesn't quite  
fit sounds like a definition mess.

Eric

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.osdl.org](mailto:Containers@lists.osdl.org)

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

---