
Subject: Re: [PATCH] diskquota: 32bit quota tools on 64bit architectures

Posted by [Anonymous Coward](#) on Wed, 25 Oct 2006 11:23:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Arnd Bergmann wrote:

```
> > +struct compat_if_dqblk {  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_bhardlimit[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_bsoftlimit[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_curspace[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_ihardlimit[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_isoftlimit[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_curinodes[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_bttime[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_itime[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_valid;  
> > +};  
> > +  
> > /* XFS structures */  
> > +struct compat_fs_qfilestat {  
> > +    compat_uint_t dqb_bhardlimit[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t qfs_nblk[2];  
> > +    compat_uint_t qfs_nextents;  
> > +};  
> > +  
>  
> The patch looks technically correct, but you have defined the structures  
> in a somewhat unusual way. I'd have defined them with  
> attribute((packed, aligned(4))) in the end.  
>  
> Or even better, we should probably add a  
>  
> typedef unsigned long long __attribute__((aligned(4))) compat_u64;  
>  
> for x86 compat and use that instead of compat_uint_t foo[2].
```

Actually I didn't use `__attribute__`, 'case I've heard, that this isn't encouraged now to use `__attribute__((...))` in kernel. But if you think it is ok, and even preferable, I will definitely redo it!

Thanks!
