Subject: [PATCH 2/5][GFS2] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
Posted by Pavel Emelianov on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 07:52:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The __mandatory_lock(inode) function makes the same check, but
makes the code more readable.

Signed-off-by: Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org>
Cc: Steven Whitehouse <swhiteho@redhat.com>

---

 fs/gfs2/ops_file.c | 4 ++--
 1 files changed, 2 insertions(+), 2 deletions(-)

diff --git a/fs/gfs2/ops_file.c b/fs/gfs2/ops_file.c
index 94d76ac..28773ca 100644
--- a/fs/gfs2/ops_file.c
+++ b/fs/gfs2/ops_file.c
@@ -535,7 +535,7 @@ static int gfs2_lock(struct file *file,

  if (!(fl->fl_flags & FL_POSIX))
   return -ENOLCK;
- if ((ip->i_inode.i_mode & (S_ISGID | S_IXGRP)) == S_ISGID)
+ if (__mandatory_lock(&ip->i_inode))
   return -ENOLCK;

  if (sdp->sd_args.ar_localflocks) {
@@ -637,7 +637,7 @@ static int gfs2_flock(struct file *file,

  if (!(fl->fl_flags & FL_FLOCK))
   return -ENOLCK;
- if ((ip->i_inode.i_mode & (S_ISGID | S_IXGRP)) == S_ISGID)
+ if (__mandatory_lock(&ip->i_inode))
   return -ENOLCK;

  if (sdp->sd_args.ar_localflocks)

Subject: Re: [PATCH 2/5][GFS2] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
Posted by akpm on Wed, 19 Sep 2007 23:50:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Mon, 17 Sep 2007 11:52:08 +0400
Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

> Subject: [PATCH 2/5][GFS2] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
> Subject: [PATCH 3/5][9PFS] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks

> Subject: [PATCH 4/5][AFS] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
> Subject: [PATCH 5/5][NFS] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks

Boring administrivial note: all these patches effectively had the same title. Because the text in "[]" is considered to be something which should be discarded when the patch is applied.

This convention is useful because things like sequence numbering, kernel version information, etc are only relevant when you sent the patch and are not relevant when the patches hit the git tree.

Bottom line: please do include the subsystem ideitification as you have tried to do, but please do not place it inside "[]".

As described in the very fine
http://www.zip.com.au/~akpm/linux/patches/stuff/tpp.txt, better Subject:s here would have been

Subject: [PATCH 2/5] GFS2: Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
Subject: [PATCH 3/5] 9PFS: Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
Subject: [PATCH 4/5] AFS: Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
Subject: [PATCH 5/5] NFS: Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks

Extreme trivia: I don't consider a colon to terminate a sentence, so if I can be bothered I'll convert "Cleanup" there to "cleanup". And I don't consider "cleanup" to be a word, so it becomes "clean up". And I'll usually remvoe the final "." from the end of the subject because it's basically just a waste of space.