Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/3] Signal semantics for pid namespaces
Posted by Sukadev Bhattiprolu on Mon, 03 Sep 2007 16:59:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oleg Nesterov [oleg@tv-sign.ru] wrote:
| On 08/31, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:
| >
| > @@ -48,7 +49,7 @@ static int sig_init_ignore(struct task_s
| > if (likely(!is_container_init(tsk->group_leader)))
| > return 0;
| >
| > - if (!in_interrupt())
| > + if (is_current_in_ancestor_pid_ns(tsk) && !in_interrupt())
| > return 0;
|
| We should return 1 in that case, afaics the logic is wrongly reversed.

Hmm. My unit tests worked as I thought they should :-)

return 1 implies we "ignore the signal" right ?

If the signal is from an ancestor namespace, and we are not in interrupt
context, we don't want to ignore the signal. no ?

|
| Oleg.

_____
Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers