

## Re: BUG-lockdep and freeze (was: Arrr! Linux 2.6.18)

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2006-09/msg09164.html>

---

- *From:* Ingo Molnar <[mingo@xxxxxxx](mailto:mingo@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 30 Sep 2006 22:49:00 +0200
- 

\* Linus Torvalds <[torvalds@xxxxxxx](mailto:torvalds@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

I mean, really: Andi, point me to anything that was a real problem when we had no unwinder at all?

personally, i like perfect stacktraces, alot. x86\_64 was a huge pain for me without the unwinder. I got so used to perfect backtraces on i686 (when using %ebp frames) during the years, and i had to look at \_many\_ backtraces with lockdep. On x86\_64 it was just constant brain-drain to think away bogus stack entries. Yes, i can do it no problem when i have to look at only a few stacktraces per day, but if it's hundreds per day it's \_alot\_ of brainpower wasted.

(i'd have been happy with an %rbp based unwinder for x86\_64, in fact i implemented it for lockdep and used it for some time on x86\_64, but Andi wanted a dwarf-based, lower-overhead one. Andi also nicely integrated it into stacktrace.c.)

Ingo

-

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/>