
Subject: Re: [PATCH 01/29] task containersv11 basic task container framework
Posted by [akpm](#) on Sun, 30 Sep 2007 09:03:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, 30 Sep 2007 00:10:18 -0700 "Paul Menage" <menage@google.com> wrote:

> On 9/29/07, Paul Jackson <pj@sgi.com> wrote:
> > Paul M:
> >
> > This patch doesn't build for me in the following case. If I apply the
> > rest of the containersv11 patches, it builds, but if I happen to bisect
> > into this set of patches having applied only:
>
> These patches weren't the normal style of incremental patchset - they
> were direct substitutions of the previous patches in Andrew's -mm
> tree.
>
> Andrew's approach when encountering patches that are, e.g. missing
> includes on some architectures, is to add a *-fix.patch to the series;
> in this case it looks as though the fix for the missing ia64 include
> was added towards the end of the series rather than directly after the
> patch that needed it.

It makes my poor little life heaps easier if people can refer to patches via their original Subject: or, better, their filename in the -mm patch series.

I have vague memories that one of the container/cgroup fixup patches was a bit of a jumbo patch which intersected multiple preceding patches. Often I will refactor such a patch into several little *-fix.patch patches so that everything lands nicely, but this time it was all too much effort and I just jammmed <whichever patch it was> onto the tail of the queue.

And I think that's OK, because we don't care about git bisectability with CONFIG_CGROUPS=y (I think?) Anyone who is bisecting through the middle of the containers patch series is not searching for a containers problem, so they can just configure it all off.

If we broke the build when CONFIG_CGROUPS=n then yeah, that's a problem.

wrt Paul's observation:

> ... also ... too bad the names of these patches all have 'container' in
> them, not 'cgroup'. I realize how this came to be, due to changing
> container to cgroup after these patches were named, but it sure would
> be nice if the final patch set record that gets layed down in Linus's
> history showed the correct name of 'cgroup' in these patch names.

that'll be OK. The "task-containers" text appears only in the filenames in the -mm patch series. Those filenames don't make an appearance in the git tree at all, so I didn't bother renaming all the files.

> Hence the fact that you couldn't compile until
> that later patch had been pushed.
>
> Andrew, is it practical for you to collapse any *-fix.patch files for
> cgroups into the appropriate patches that they fix? That would
> simplify the patch set a bit.

Yep, I always do that prior to sending to Linus, so everything hits the git tree as nicely as possible.

I normally defer that patch-folding exercise until the last minute, but I will occasionally do a big fold-some-patches-together pass, just to reduce the plain number of patches which I'm carrying. It gets irritating when this:

```
box:/usr/src/25> grep foo patches/*  
zsh: argument list too long: grep
```

happens.

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