

## Re: [PATCH] protect remove\_proc\_entry

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2005-12/msg08462.html>

---

- *From:* Mitchell Blank Jr <[mitch@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mitch@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 30 Dec 2005 13:55:44 -0800
- 

Steven Rostedt wrote:

> I've added a global remove\_proc\_lock to protect this section of code. I  
> was going to add a lock to proc\_dir\_entry so that the locking is only  
> cut down to the same parent, but since this function is called so  
> infrequently, why waste more memory then is needed. One global lock  
> should not cause too much of a headache here.

Are you sure that it's the only place where we need guard ->subdir? It looks like proc\_lookup() and proc\_readdir() use the BLK when walking that list, so probably the best fix would be to use that lock everywhere else ->subdir is touched

-Mitch

-

To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in the body of a message to [majordomo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:majordomo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

Please read the FAQ at <http://www.tux.org/lkml/>

---

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **[Re: \[PATCH\] protect remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**  
    ◇ *From:* Steven Rostedt
- ◆ **[Re: \[PATCH\] protect remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**  
    ◇ *From:* Steven Rostedt

- *References:*

- ◆ **[\[Question\] race condition with remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**  
    ◇ *From:* Steven Rostedt
- ◆ **[\[PATCH\] protect remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**  
    ◇ *From:* Steven Rostedt

- Prev by Date: **[Re: system keeps freezing once every 24 hours / random apps crashing](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: \[PATCH\] protect remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: \[PATCH\] protect remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: \[PATCH\] protect remove\\_proc\\_entry](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**

Re: [PATCH] protect remove\_proc\_entry

◆ *Thread*