
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] rename 'struct pid'
Posted by [dev](#) on Wed, 11 Apr 2007 07:59:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Hansen wrote:

> On Tue, 2007-04-10 at 22:52 -0600, Eric W. Biederman wrote:
>
>> Dave Hansen <hansendc@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.

Totally agree with Dave.

Current code looks like a mess of word 'pid'.

Eric, why do you object so much? it doesn't change any functionality at all
just makes code a bit more readable/clear.

Dave, taskref sounds a bit too much generic for me...
But I can't provide some better name :/

pid - number

pref (or tref) - process (task) ref, e.g. pid(filp->f_owner.pref)
pref_struct - former pid_struct, e.g. struct pref_struct pref;
?

Thanks,
Kirill

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
