Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/3] clone64() and unshare64() system calls Posted by Cedric Le Goater on Thu, 10 Apr 2008 06:48:50 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
H. Peter Anvin wrote:
> sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:
>> This is a resend of the patch set Cedric had sent earlier. I ported
>> the patch set to 2.6.25-rc8-mm1 and tested on x86 and x86_64.
>> ---
>>
>> We have run out of the 32 bits in clone_flags!
>> This patchset introduces 2 new system calls which support 64bit
>> clone-flags.
>>
      long sys_clone64(unsigned long flags_high, unsigned long flags_low,
>>
        unsigned long newsp);
>>
>>
      long sys unshare64(unsigned long flags high, unsigned long
>>
>> flags_low);
>>
>> The current version of clone64() does not support CLONE PARENT SETTID
>> and CLONE_CHILD_CLEARTID because we would exceed the 6 registers limit
>> of some arches. It's possible to get around this limitation but we
>> might not
>> need it as we already have clone()
>>
>
> I really dislike this interface.
> If you're going to make it a 64-bit pass it in as a 64-bit number,
> instead of breaking it into two numbers. Better yet, IMO, would be to
> pass a pointer to a structure like:
> struct shared {
    unsigned long nwords:
>
    unsigned long flags[];
>
> };
> ... which can be expanded indefinitely.
ok.
```

What about the copy_from_user() overhead ? is this something we care about for a clone like syscall ?

If not, this would certainly make our life simpler to extend clone flags. I'm ready to implement anything if someone would just tell me in which

direction.	
Thanks!	
C.	
Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers	