
Subject: Re: [PATCH 7/15] Helpers to obtain pid numbers
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Fri, 27 Jul 2007 06:40:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Hansen wrote:

> On Thu, 2007-07-26 at 18:51 +0400, Pavel Emelyanov wrote:
>> + * pid_nr() : global id, i.e. the id seen from the init namespace;
>> + * pid_vnr() : virtual id, i.e. the id seen from the namespace this pid
>> + * belongs to. this only makes sense when called in the
>> + * context of the task that belongs to the same namespace;
>
> Can we give these some better names? I think "virtual" is pretty bad,
> especially if you consider the multiple level of pid namespaces that we
> might have some day. Processes can belong to multiple pid namespaces,
> and thus have multiple "virtual" ids.

We do have them now (multiple levels). The "virtual" stands for "the one that task sees by his own".

> Even though it will make the names longer, I think we need something in
> the names to say that "pid_nr()" is the top-level, global, init_pid_ns
> number. "pid_vnr()" is the pid for the lowest pid namespace in the
> hierarchy.

That's it.

> Suka called this an "active pid namespace" because that is
> where the task actively interacts with its peers. But, I'm open to
> other suggestions, too.
>
> When writing code, people are going to need to know which one to use:
> pid_nr() or pid_vnr(). We can document the functions, but the names
> will help much more than any documentation.

I do not mind, but what other names can we have? pid_nr() for init namespace,
pid_nr_ns for arbitrary namespace and pid_<what> for the lower-level namespace?

>
> -- Dave
>
>

Thanks,
Pavel
