
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 1/2] add user namespace [try #2]
Posted by [Dave Hansen](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 15:40:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Mon, 2006-08-28 at 17:32 +0200, Cedric Le Goater wrote:

> Dave Hansen wrote:
> > On Mon, 2006-08-28 at 16:56 +0200, Cedric Le Goater wrote:
> >> `+#define UIDHASH_BITS (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 3 : 8)`
> >
> > How about an actual `#ifdef` here?
>
> yep. because i moved from a .c to .h and/or to improve readability ?

Just for readability. Maybe my brain is defective, but I just don't parse the `foo?bar:baz` stuff very well.

> > Or, should we just do this one in Kconfig?
>
> do you mean defining `UIDHASH_BITS` in `KCONFIG` ? We would need to that for
> other constant then and a fast `grep` gives me :

Something like

```
#define UIDHASH_BITS CONFIG_UID_HASH_BITS
```

```
config UID_HASH_BITS  
int  
default 3 if BASE_SMALL  
default 8
```

But, I guess the incentive is pretty small when there are really only two values, and the logic is extremely simple.

```
> include/asm-i386/mach-default/mach_mpspec.h:#if CONFIG_BASE_SMALL == 0  
> include/linux/threads.h:#define PID_MAX_DEFAULT (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 0x1000  
> : 0x8000)  
> include/linux/threads.h:#define PID_MAX_LIMIT (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ?  
> PAGE_SIZE * 8 : \  
> include/linux/user.h:#define UIDHASH_BITS (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 3 : 8)  
> include/linux/vt_kern.h:#define CON_BUF_SIZE (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 256 :  
> PAGE_SIZE)  
> include/linux/autoconf.h:#define CONFIG_BASE_SMALL 0  
> include/config/auto.conf:CONFIG_BASE_SMALL=0  
> kernel/futex.c:#define FUTEX_HASHBITS (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 4 : 8)  
> kernel/timer.c:#define TVN_BITS (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 4 : 6)  
> kernel/timer.c:#define TVR_BITS (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 6 : 8)  
> lib/radix-tree.c:#define RADIX_TREE_MAP_SHIFT (CONFIG_BASE_SMALL ? 4 : 6)  
>
```

> we should probably keep it that way.

I know, I know. ;) But, a lot of these definitions were from before we had our nice, pretty Kconfig language. I don't think it's much of a crime to break tradition on these.

Anyway, it's not a big deal either way.

-- Dave

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 1/2] add user namespace [try #2]
Posted by [Cedric Le Goater](#) on Mon, 28 Aug 2006 16:16:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Hansen wrote:

> Something like
>
> #define UIDHASH_BITS CONFIG_UID_HASH_BITS
>
> config UID_HASH_BITS
> int
> default 3 if BASE_SMALL
> default 8
>
> But, I guess the incentive is pretty small when there are really only
> two values, and the logic is extremely simple.

limiting the number of users per container could be something useful. we could use such a configuration variable to define more appropriately the size of the hash table.

using a hlist_head in user_namespace should also save some space.

C.

Containers mailing list
Containers@lists.osdl.org
<https://lists.osdl.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
