Subject: Re: [RFC] Transactional CGroup task attachment
Posted by Peter Zijlstra on Mon, 14 Jul 2008 10:50:01 GMT

On Fri, 2008-07-11 at 17:03 -0700, Matt Helsley wrote:
> On Wed, 2008-07-09 at 23:46 -0700, Paul Menage wrote:

> > struct cgroup_attach_state {
>
> nit: How about naming it cgroup_attach_request or
> cgroup_attach_request_state? I suggest this because it's not really
> "state" that's kept beyond the prepare-then-(commit|abort) sequence.

Other alternatives: cgroup_attach_context, cgroup_attach_txn

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