
Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH] rename 'struct pid'
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Wed, 11 Apr 2007 01:28:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave Hansen <hansendc@us.ibm.com> writes:

> I've been hacking quite a bit on the pidspace code. I've run
> into a bug or two, and had a heck of a time debugging it.
> Other than my inferior puny monkey brain, I'm directing some
> of the blame squarely in the direction of the 'struct pid'.
>
> We have pid_t, pid_ns, struct pid and pid_link, at _least_.
> Seeing code like get_pid(pid->pid_ns->pid_type[PIDTYPE_PID])
> is mind-numbing to say the least.

get_pid(pid->pid_ns->pid_type[PIDTYPE_PID]) is complete and utter nonsense.

> It makes it really hard to comprehend, and even harder to debug.

Given that you quoted nonsense I can understand the comprehension problem.

> We honestly have a lot of code like this:
>
> pid = pid_nr(filp->f_owner.pid);
>
> WTF? It's getting a pid from a pid? Huh? :)

Clearer would be:

```
user_pid = pid_to_user(filp->f_owner.pid);
```

> It makes sense when you go look at the structures, but
> sitting in the middle of a function and when you can't see
> all of the struct declarations can be really sketchy.
>
> So, I propose that we rename the one structure that seems to
> be the focus of the problem: 'struct pid'.

NAK.

> Fundamentally, it
> is a 'process identifier': it helps the kernel to identify
> processes. However, as I noted, 'pid' is a wee bit overloaded.
>
> In addition to "identifying" processes, this structure acts

> as an indirection or handle to them. So, I propose we call
> these things 'struct task_ref'.

Renaming the structure above doesn't help and the structure represents
a pid in a more fundamental way than pid_t can. A pid (pid_t or
struct pid) isn't just an identifier it is a handle to processes.
struct pid just does so more directly because it is inside the kernel.

> Just reading some of the
> code that I've modified in here makes me feel like this is
> the right way.

I get exactly the opposite impression.

> Compare the two sentences below:
>
> Oh, I have a task_ref? What kind is it? Oh, it's a pgid
> reference because I have REFTYPE_PGID.
>
> Oh, I have a pid? What kind is it? Oh, it's a pid because
> I have PIDTYPE_PID.
>
> Which makes more sense?

Neither the questions are nonsense. The only reasonable question
is which kind of process am I using the pid to look for.

> So, this still needs some work converting some of the
> function names, but it compiles as-is. Any ideas for better
> names?

struct pid is properly named. It isn't even as fuzzy as struct
signal_struct.

All I can suggest is making a clearer distinction between user and
kernel pids. So maybe it could become struct kpid. Even there
I'm not certain it makes sense except in variable names.

Eric

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