

Re: [patch] Re: dlopen() and dlclose() are not MT-safe? YES, esp. for libthr

## Re: [patch] Re: dlopen() and dlclose() are not MT-safe? YES, esp. for libthr

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/hackers/2006-03/msg00237.html>

---

- *From:* Kazuaki Oda <[kaakun@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kaakun@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 24 Mar 2006 20:54:34 +0900
- 

Kostik Belousov wrote:

I did understand the purpose of the thread mask code in libexec/rtd/rtd\_lock.c, or, more precisely, the condition where this code works (for the context, see the mails with same subject on freebsd-hackers).

Look, that code assumes that blocking async signals would stop thread scheduler from doing preemption of the current thread. This works for libc\_r, but fails in libpthread and libthr cases. libpthread provides implementation of the locks for rtd. But libthr does not !

As result, rtd exhibit races when used with libthr. In other words, libthr needs code to do proper locking.

Do you agree ? Does somebody already planned to do this work ?

Best regards,  
Kostik Belousov

I'm a bit confused. Do you mean the following?

- \* The current implementation of rtd has a problem both with libpthread and libthr. It works only with libc\_r.
- \* In libpthread case, the problem goes away if we modify rtd code.
- \* In libthr case, in addition to above, we must modify libthr code to provide implementation of the locks for rtd.

right?

--  
Kazuaki Oda

---

freebsd-hackers@xxxxxxxxxxxxx mailing list  
<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-hackers>  
To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-hackers-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxxxx"