

Re: a question regarding <sys/shm.h>

## Re: a question regarding <sys/shm.h>

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/hackers/2007-01/msg00377.html>

---

- *From:* Pascal Hofstee <caelian@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 31 Jan 2007 10:29:11 +0100
- 

Peter Jeremy wrote:

Whilst I agree that the Linux defn is the more sensible one, System V IPC and common sense are not commonly found together. Traditionally the definition was "int". It appears that the definition changed from "int" to "size\_t" in issue 5 of the Open Group base definition but FreeBSD has not caught up with this.

I'm not sure what plans there are to change this. You could try putting together a patch to address this and submitting it as a PR (this means addressing all references to shm\_segsz in the base system, not just <sys/shm.h>).

First of all, thanks for the quick response. At the very least this sheds some light onto the history and how this situation likely came to pass. I'll see if i can put together a patch during the next week or so that would bring our definitions regarding System V IPC in synch, i'll also try to see if i can find additional occurrences of similar discrepancies so these could be fixed in a single run.

Any additional suggestions/objections are always greatly appreciated.

—

Pascal Hofstee

---

freebsd-hackers@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-hackers>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-hackers-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"