Subject: Re: [PATCH] Make common helpers for seq_files that work with list_head-s Posted by Andrew Morton on Thu, 17 May 2007 17:36:55 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Thu, 17 May 2007 19:19:40 +0400 Pavel Emelianov <xemul@sw.ru> wrote:

```
> Many places in kernel use seg file API to iterate over a regular
> list head. The code for such iteration is identical in all the
> places, so it's worth introducing a common helpers.
>
> This makes code more than 300 lines smaller.
> Cc-ed are people, who maintain the code altered by the patch.
>
> Signed-off-by: Pavel Emelianov <xemul@openvz.org>
>
> block/genhd.c
                                           40 +++----
> crypto/proc.c
                                           17 ---
> drivers/char/misc.c
                                            18 ----
> drivers/input/input.c
                                            29 -----
                                              1 28 -----
> drivers/isdn/capi/kcapi proc.c
> fs/afs/proc.c
                                        | 81 ++----
> fs/namespace.c
                                          1 14 ---
> fs/nfs/client.c
                                         54 +----
> fs/proc/proc_tty.c
                                         | 15 ---
> include/linux/seq_file.h
                                           35 ++++++
> kernel/module.c
                                          | 17 ---
> mm/slab.c
                                        | 28 +----
> net/atm/br2684.c
                                          | 22 ----
                                         | 39 -----
> net/core/sock.c
> net/ipv4/netfilter/nf conntrack | 3proto ipv4 compat.c | 27 -----
                                                | 27 -----
> net/netfilter/nf_conntrack_expect.c
> net/rxrpc/ar-proc.c
                                          | 48 +-----
```

Can't complain about the diffstat. Please experiment with uninlining seq_list_start(), see if that reduces overall text size.

> 17 files changed, 116 insertions(+), 423 deletions(-)

And as Dmitry indicated, it would be less disruptive if we could have the one core patch then a stream of per-subsystem patches, please.