Ruby - Bug #13491

MinGW 58400 - TestSocket_BasicSocket#test_read_write_nonblock

04/21/2017 03:16 PM - MSP-Greg (Greg L)

Status:	Closed		
Priority:	Normal		
Assignee:			
Target version:			
ruby -v:	ruby 2.5.0dev (2017-04-21 trunk 58426) [x64-mingw32]	**Backport:**	2.2: UNKNOWN, 2.3: UNKNOWN, 2.4: UNKNOWN

Description

The test TestSocket_BasicSocket#test_read_write_nonblock was recently add via 58400 / c32fc82.

On a MinGW build, it fails. The following change at line 197 allows a MinGW build to pass.

```
    case r = ssock.read_nonblock(16384, buf, exception: false)
    when String
      next
    when nil
      break
    else
-     flunk "unexpected read_nonblock return: #{r.inspect}"
+     flunk "unexpected read_nonblock return: #{r.inspect}" unless set_nb
    end while true
```

See GitHub PR 1595

History

#1 - 04/21/2017 05:08 PM - normalperson (Eric Wong)

Greg.mpls@gmail.com wrote:

> The test TestSocket_BasicSocket#test_read_write_nonblock was recently add via 58400 / c32fc82.
>
> On a MinGW build, it fails. The following change at line 197 allows a MinGW build to pass.
>
> ```
>     case r = ssock.read_nonblock(16384, buf, exception: false)
>     when String
>       next
>     when nil
>       break
>     else
> -     flunk "unexpected read_nonblock return: #{r.inspect}"
> +     flunk "unexpected read_nonblock return: #{r.inspect}" unless set_nb
>     end while true
> ```

Oops, but wouldn't checking for :wait_readable be more correct?
Can you try the following, instead?

diff --git a/test/socket/test_basicsocket.rb b/test/socket/test_basicsocket.rb
index 0b13a7f1af..4d11521e9e 100644
--- a/test/socket/test_basicsocket.rb
+++ b/test/socket/test_basicsocket.rb
@@ -193,6 +193,9 @@ def test_read_write_nonblock
next
when nil
break

- ███████████████████████

- ████████████████████████████████

- ██████████████████████████████

else
flunk "unexpected read_nonblock return: #{r.inspect}"
end while true

Thanks.

#2 - 04/21/2017 08:42 PM - normalperson (Eric Wong)

Can you try r58437? I made it call IO.select on :wait_readable
instead of using your change.
Thanks.

#3 - 04/21/2017 09:00 PM - MSP-Greg (Greg L)

normalperson (Eric Wong) wrote:

> Can you try r58437?

Works. I guess I was staring at the case statement, I should have added the test for :wait_readable. I tried IO.select, but I left of the timeout...

Thank you. I'll close the PR and this can be closed.

#4 - 04/22/2017 03:50 AM - usa (Usaku NAKAMURA)

- Status changed from Open to Closed

I got same error, too.
And it seems that r58437 has fixed it.
I still doubt that there is something wrong with IO#read_nonblock on Windows, but, about this issue, can be closed.

#5 - 04/22/2017 04:08 AM - normalperson (Eric Wong)

usa@garbagecollect.jp wrote:

> I got same error, too.
> And it seems that r58437 has fixed it.
> I still doubt that there is something wrong with IO#read_nonblock on Windows, but, about this issue, can be closed.

Nothing wrong, just different behavior and I was sloppy.
I have encountered similar socket behavior differences before,
even between Linux and *BSD.