
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_btime[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_nblks[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!
