
Subject: Re: [PATCH 9/15] Move alloc_pid() after the namespace is cloned
Posted by [Sukadev Bhattiprolu](#) on Mon, 30 Jul 2007 23:43:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pavel Emelianov [xemul@openvz.org] wrote:

| Oleg Nesterov wrote:

| >On 07/26, Pavel Emelyanov wrote:

| >>This is a fix for Sukadev's patch that moved the alloc_pid() call from
| >>do_fork() into copy_process().

| >

| >... and this patch changes almost every line from Sukadev's patch.

|

| It does. My bad :(I have reviewed Suka's patch badly and was sure it
| puts the alloc_pid() right where we need this.

I should have reviewed Pavel's closely too. Sorry.

|

| >Sorry gents, but isn't it better to ask Andrew to drop that patch
| >(which is quite useless by itself), and send a new one which incorporates
| >all necessary changes? Imho, it would be much easier to understand.

|

| Hm... Maybe it's better to ask him to fold these patches together?

I think so, but even dropping my patch is fine with me.

|

| >>@@ -1406,7 +1422,13 @@ long do_fork(unsigned long clone_flags,

| >> if (!IS_ERR(p)) {

| >> struct completion vfork;

| >>

| >>- nr = pid_nr(task_pid(p));

| >>+ /*

| >>+ * this is enough to call pid_nr_ns here, but this if

| >>+ * improves optimisation of regular fork()

| >>+ */

| >>+ nr = (clone_flags & CLONE_NEWPID) ?

| >>+ task_pid_nr_ns(p, current->nsproxy->pid_ns) :

| >>+ task_pid_vnr(p);

| >

| >Shouldn't we do the same for CLONE_PARENT_SETTID in copy_process() ?

| >Otherwise *parent_tidptr may have a wrong value which doesn't match

| >to what fork() returns.

|

| Oops. We should. Thanks :)

|

| >Oleg.

|

| Thanks,
| Pavel
