

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 5/13] Expand the pid/task seeking functions set  
Posted by [Pavel Emelianov](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 07:08:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dave Hansen wrote:

```
> On Thu, 2007-05-24 at 16:50 +0400, Pavel Emelianov wrote:
>> +struct pid * fastcall __find_vpid(int nr, struct pid_namespace *ns)
>> +{
>> +#ifdef CONFIG_PID_NS
>> +    struct hlist_node *elem;
>> +    struct pid *pid;
>> +#endif
>> +
>> +    if (ns == &init_pid_ns)
>> +        return find_pid(nr);
>> +
>> +#ifdef CONFIG_PID_NS
>> +    hlist_for_each_entry_rcu(pid, elem,
>> +        &vpid_hash[vpid_hashfn(nr, ns)], vpid_chain) {
>> +        if (pid->vnr == nr && pid->ns == ns)
>> +            return pid;
>> +    }
>> +#endif
>> +    return NULL;
>> +}
>
> I am a bit worried that there are too many #ifdefs here. Your patch
> series adds ~20 of them, and they look to me to be mostly in .c files.
> Section 2 in SubmittingPatches somewhat discourages this.
>
> Do you have any plans for cleaning these up?
```

Sure I have. But this approach makes review simpler - everyone explicitly see what exact actions are taken in each place. In the second iteration this will be made in a more elegant way like making static inline stubs etc.

This set is a kind of RFC and proof-of-concept. I didn't intend this to be merged to any tree as is. That's why I attached the latest patch with struts in proc to observe the whole tree.

BTW, question to Sukadev - how did you test your patches? I do know that ps utility doesn't work without full /proc tree and I don't see similar hacks in your patchset.

```
> -- Dave
>
>
```

---

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

---