
Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] Pid ns helpers for signals
Posted by [Sukadev Bhattiprolu](#) on Mon, 03 Sep 2007 16:01:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oleg Nesterov [oleg@tv-sign.ru] wrote:

| On 09/01, Oleg Nesterov wrote:

| >

| > On 08/31, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

| > >

| > > +static struct pid_namespace *get_task_pid_ns(struct task_struct *tsk)

| > > +{

| > > + struct pid *pid;

| > > + struct pid_namespace *ns;

| > > +

| > > + pid = get_task_pid(tsk, PIDTYPE_PID);

| > > + ns = get_pid_ns(pid_active_ns(pid));

| > > + put_pid(pid);

| > > +

| > > + return ns;

| > > +}

| >

| > Hmm. Firstly, we don't need this for the "current", but all users of this func

| > also do get_task_pid_ns(current).

| >

| > Also, we don't need get/put_pid. rcu locks are enough,

| >

| > rcu_read_lock();

| > ns = get_pid_ns(pid_active_ns(task_pid(tsk)));

| > rcu_read_unlock();

| >

| > However, do we really need this complications right now? Currently, we use

| > this "compare namespaces" helpers only when we know that "struct pid" is

| > stable. We are sending the signal to that task, it must be pid_alive(), and

| > we either locked the task itself, or we hold tasklist.

|

| (forgot to mention)

|

| Otherwise, it is not safe to use "tsk" in get_task_pid_ns(), so I don't think

| these get/put pid/pid_ns games make too much sense.

get_pid(), put_pid(), get_pid_ns(), put_pid_ns() all allow pid to be NULL.

You mean tsk itself can be NULL bc task is exiting ?

|

| Oleg.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

