- Indicate whether the following statements are true or false. Justify your answer.
 - a) Buffering can be used to improve I/O efficiency for files that are being written and re-read rapidly.
 - b) Process will be in either running or ready state after performing an I/O system call if non-blocking I/O is used.
 - c) Device drivers are part of the kernel I/O subsystem.

- Indicate whether the following statements are true or false. Justify your answer.
 - a) Buffering can be used to improve I/O efficiency for files that are being written and re-read rapidly.
 - False: Buffering is mainly used to cope with device speed mismatch or transfer size mismatch.
 - b) Process will be in either running or ready state after performing an I/O system call if non-blocking I/O is used.
 - False: Using non-blocking I/O, the process will be able to continue to execute after the system call.
 - c) Device drivers are part of the kernel I/O subsystem.

 False. Device drivers are not part of the kernel I/O subsystem.

Suppose that in a multiprogramming system, a process reads blocks of data from a file on disk for processing. As shown below, it reads one block of data at a time to a buffer using synchronous I/O and then processes the data.

```
while ( not end of file) {
          buffer <- read a block of data from disk using synchronous I/O;
          process data in buffer;
}</pre>
```

- Discuss how the performance of the above process can be improved.
- b) For a system running mainly with this type of processes, which file allocation scheme is best in terms of I/O performance?

Q2 (a)

- Discuss how the performance of the above process can be improved
- Using double-buffer and asynchronous I/O

```
buffer2<- read a block of data from disk using asynchronous I/O;
while ( not end of file ) {
    while ( I/O not over ) do nothing;
    buffer1 <- buffer2;
    buffer2<- read next block of data from disk using asynchronous I/O;
    process data in buffer1;
```

Q2 (b)

For a system running mainly with this type of processes, which file allocation scheme is best in terms of I/O performance?

→ Contiguous file allocation is most suitable.

During his presentation, a salesman emphasized on the substantial effort his company has made to improve the performance of their UNIX version one example he quoted was that the disk driver used the SCAN algorithm and also queued multiple requests within a cylinder in sector order. You bought a copy and wrote a program to randomly read 10,000 blocks spread across the disk. The performance measured was the same as what would be expected from FCFS algorithm. Was the salesman lying?

Q3 (a)

- · Not necessarily.
 - if the requests are issued one at a time.
 - The disk driver has no opportunity for SCAN optimization (SCAN=FCFS)
- Solution: generates many concurrent
 I/Os

Q3 (b)

Under what circumstances could a disk scheduling discipline not improve the performance or even degrade performance of the system?

Q3 (b)

- Under light load conditions.
- If overhead for scheduling is significantly more than the average seek time.

Assume that a disk drive has 200 cylinders, numbered 0 to 199. The disk head starts at cylinder 0. A seek takes (20 + 0.1×T) milliseconds, where T is the number of cylinders to move. Rotational latency is 2 milliseconds and data transfer per request takes 8 milliseconds, assuming each request accesses the same amount of data. The following table shows the arrival time and destination cylinder number of requests:

Arrive Time (ms)	0	15	20	23	30	35	50	65	70	88
Cylinder Number	45	132	35	4	23	50	70	40	10	35

Compute the average time to service a request using the Shortest Seek Time First (SSTF) disk head scheduling algorithm.

What is the time for one request?

- Service time
- = seek time + rotational latency + data transfer time
- = 20+0.1*T+2+8

Average Service Time

Arrive Time (ms)	0	15	20	23	30	35	50	65	70	88
Cylinder Number	45	132	35	4	23	50	70	40	10	35
			lack		\uparrow			\uparrow		\frown

Cylinder No.	Time Taken for Servicing the Request	Accumulated Time
45	20 + 0.1×45 + 2 + 8 = 34.5	
35	$20 + 0.1 \times 10 + 2 + 8 = 31$	65.5
40	$20 + 0.1 \times 5 + 2 + 8 = 30.5$	96.0
35	$20 + 0.1 \times 5 + 2 + 8 = 30.5$	126.5
23	20 + 0.1×12 + 2 + 8 = 31.2	157.7
10	20 + 0.1×13 + 2 + 8 = 31.3	189.0
4	$20 + 0.1 \times 6 + 2 + 8 = 30.6$	219.6
50	20 + 0.1×46 + 2 + 8 = 34.6	254.2
70	$20 + 0.1 \times 20 + 2 + 8 = 32$	286.2
132	20 + 0.1×62 + 2 + 8 = 36.2	322.4

Average=322.4/10=32.24 milliseconds.