
Subject: Re: Re: [RFC][PATCH] rename 'struct pid'

Posted by [dev](#) on Wed, 11 Apr 2007 07:40:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> Dave Hansen wrote:

>

>>On Tue, 2007-04-10 at 22:52 -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:

>>

>>>Dave Hansen <hansenc@us.ibm.com> writes:

>>>

>>>>A pid (pid_t or

>>>>struct pid) isn't just an identifier it is a handle to processes.

>>>>struct pid just does so more directly because it is inside the kernel.

>>>>

>>>>Let's face it, "pid" has a meaning. It's a number. It's what you

>>>>kill(1). The meaning has been there for a long, long time. 'struct

>>>>pid' is a completely different concept, and it's certainly more than

>>>>"just a number".

>>>

>>>Yes. "pid" has a meaning. The meaning is old and well established.

>>>That meaning is not just a number, just like a file descriptor is not

>>>just a number.

>>

>>That's a great example. Userspace fds are to 'struct file' as pids are

>>to 'struct pid', right?

>>

>>I actually think 'struct file' is a pretty good name. Think of what

>>do_sys_open() might look like if we called 'struct file' 'struct fd'

>>instead and 'fdp' instead of 'filp'.

>>

>>We end up with lines like:

>>

>> fd_install(fd, fdp);

>>

>>Which makes it confusing which fd we're dealing with or what the 'fd_'

>>in the name refers to, the 'fd' or the 'fdp'. It makes quite a bit of

>>sense to have 'fd' and 'struct file' named quite distinctly.

>

>

> Agree. int fd is a *file* descriptor, i.e. a number that describes

> a file, which is a struct file essentially. That's the way pids must

> be represented. E.g. the pid_t is a number, that references some

> kernel-space object. This object is to be called somehow more

> descriptive than just struct pid.

>

> Maybe it's worth renaming struct pid into struct pid_struct to

> represent the fact, that this is a pid, but also a structure?

it helps struct name only.
while fields should be renamed as well somehow.

Kirill
