
Subject: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 14:45:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There is no reason to have a flags field, and then a separate bool field just to indicate if the clone_children flag is set.
Make it a flag

Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>

kernel/cgroup.c | 6 +++---
1 files changed, 3 insertions(+), 3 deletions(-)

diff --git a/kernel/cgroup.c b/kernel/cgroup.c

index e4b9d3c..fa405ee 100644

--- a/kernel/cgroup.c

+++ b/kernel/cgroup.c

@@ -231,6 +231,7 @@ inline int cgroup_is_removed(const struct cgroup *cgrp)
/* bits in struct cgroupfs_root flags field */

enum {

ROOT_NOPREFIX, /* mounted subsystems have no named prefix */

+ ROOT_CLONE_CHILDREN, /* mounted subsystems starts with clone_children */
};

static int cgroup_is_releasable(const struct cgroup *cgrp)

@@ -1062,7 +1063,6 @@ struct cgroup_sb_opts {

unsigned long subsys_bits;

unsigned long flags;

char *release_agent;

- bool clone_children;

char *name;

/* User explicitly requested empty subsystem */

bool none;

@@ -1113,7 +1113,7 @@ static int parse_cgroupfs_options(char *data, struct cgroup_sb_opts
*opts)

continue;

}

if (!strcmp(token, "clone_children")) {

- opts->clone_children = true;

+ set_bit(ROOT_CLONE_CHILDREN, &opts->flags);

continue;

}

if (!strncmp(token, "release_agent=", 14)) {

@@ -1400,7 +1400,7 @@ static struct cgroupfs_root *cgroup_root_from_opts(struct
cgroup_sb_opts *opts)

strcpy(root->release_agent_path, opts->release_agent);

if (opts->name)

strcpy(root->name, opts->name);

```
- if (opts->clone_children)
+ if (test_bit(ROOT_CLONE_CHILDREN, &opts->flags))
    set_bit(CGRP_CLONE_CHILDREN, &root->top_cgroup.flags);
return root;
}
--
1.7.6.4
```

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag
Posted by [KOSAKI Motohiro](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 18:58:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

(12/11/11 9:45 AM), Glauber Costa wrote:
> There is no reason to have a flags field, and then a separate
> bool field just to indicate if the clone_children flag is set.
> Make it a flag
>
> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa<glommer@parallels.com>
> ---
> kernel/cgroup.c | 6 +++---
> 1 files changed, 3 insertions(+), 3 deletions(-)

Reviewed-by: KOSAKI Motohiro <kosaki.motohiro@jp.fujitsu.com>

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag
Posted by [Tejun Heo](#) on Tue, 13 Dec 2011 15:39:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Sun, Dec 11, 2011 at 03:45:37PM +0100, Glauber Costa wrote:
> There is no reason to have a flags field, and then a separate
> bool field just to indicate if the clone_children flag is set.
> Make it a flag
>
> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>

Doesn't this change how remount conditions are checked?

Thanks.

--
tejun

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag

Posted by [Li Zefan](#) on Wed, 14 Dec 2011 02:28:17 GMT

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

Tejun Heo wrote:

> On Sun, Dec 11, 2011 at 03:45:37PM +0100, Glauber Costa wrote:

>> There is no reason to have a flags field, and then a separate

>> bool field just to indicate if the clone_children flag is set.

>> Make it a flag

>>

>> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa <glommer@parallels.com>

>

> Doesn't this change how remount conditions are checked?

>

Right. Currently we can do this:

```
# mount -t cgroup xxx /mnt
# mount -o remount,clone_children /mnt
```

with this patch, the above remount will fail.

But..the current behaviour of remount is a bit confusing in that remount with/without "clone_children" has no effect on anything:

```
# mount -t cgroup -o clone_children xxx /mnt
# cat /mnt/cgroup.clone_children
1
# mount -o remount xxx /mnt
# mount | grep cgroup
xxx on /mnt type cgroup (rw,clone_children)
# cat /mnt/cgroup.clone_children
1
```

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag

Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Wed, 14 Dec 2011 07:09:14 GMT

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

On 12/14/2011 06:29 AM, Li Zefan wrote:

> Tejun Heo wrote:

>> On Sun, Dec 11, 2011 at 03:45:37PM +0100, Glauber Costa wrote:

>>> There is no reason to have a flags field, and then a separate

>>> bool field just to indicate if the clone_children flag is set.

>>> Make it a flag

>>>

>>> Signed-off-by: Glauber Costa<glommer@parallels.com>

>>

>> Doesn't this change how remount conditions are checked?

>>

Well, I was thinking it wouldn't, because I patched all callers. But I forget life is not always that simple: After you mentioned, I checked and we do test for changes in the flag field explicitly on remount. So I missed that, indeed.

> Right. Currently we can do this:

>

> # mount -t cgroup xxx /mnt

> # mount -o remount,clone_children /mnt

>

> with this patch, the above remount will fail.

>

> But..the current behaviour of remount is a bit confusing in that remount with/without "clone_children" has no effect on anything:

>

> # mount -t cgroup -o clone_children xxx /mnt

> # cat /mnt/cgroup.clone_children

> 1

> # mount -o remount xxx /mnt

> # mount | grep cgroup

> xxx on /mnt type cgroup (rw,clone_children)

> # cat /mnt/cgroup.clone_children

> 1

That's indeed confusing, and it comes from the fact that we always inherit clone_children from the parent - which is sane, IMHO. So this flag only has any value in establishing the initial behaviour of the top root cgroup. I wonder then if it wouldn't better to just be explicit and fail in this case ?

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag
Posted by [Tejun Heo](#) on Wed, 14 Dec 2011 18:18:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,

On Wed, Dec 14, 2011 at 11:09:14AM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:

> That's indeed confusing, and it comes from the fact that we always
> inherit clone_children from the parent - which is sane, IMHO. So
> this flag only has any value in establishing the initial behaviour
> of the top root cgroup. I wonder then if it wouldn't better to just
> be explicit and fail in this case ?

I don't think all current behaviors are sane and if not let's change them, but those things have to be explicit with proper description and

rationale.

Thanks.

--

tejun

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/3] make clone_children a flag
Posted by [Glauber Costa](#) on Thu, 15 Dec 2011 07:03:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 12/14/2011 10:18 PM, Tejun Heo wrote:

> Hello,

>

> On Wed, Dec 14, 2011 at 11:09:14AM +0400, Glauber Costa wrote:

>> That's indeed confusing, and it comes from the fact that we always

>> inherit clone_children from the parent - which is sane, IMHO. So

>> this flag only has any value in establishing the initial behaviour

>> of the top root cgroup. I wonder then if it wouldn't better to just

>> be explicit and fail in this case ?

>

> I don't think all current behaviors are sane and if not let's change

> them, but those things have to be explicit with proper description and

> rationale.

>

140 % agree to that. As I said, I wrongly believed it to be functionally
equivalent when I sent it, but missed the flags remount check.

If you believe the behavior we now get is saner, I can rewrite the
Changelog and resend it.
