Examining the results of the tests has led to various conclusions on the effectiveness of the three types of scheduling. The first conclusion gathered was gathered from the first come first serve portion of the test. In the tests where the largest processes (largest execution time)arrived earliest they had a huge advantage when it came to turnaround, while the shorter ones suffered greatly. On the other hand when the smaller processes came first the larger processes weren't affected significantly in terms of their turn around. The turn around time of longer processes going later only sees an increase to a minor degree when compared with execution time then the smaller processes going later. With red robin every process is equally inflated with very large turnaround times with no one process being favoured. The comparison of execution time versus turnaround time is much greater for each process without any of them benefiting. With the largest process in test 0, the first process, having its execution time inflated by over 4 times it's execution time and the shortest processes, two and four seeing an increase 6 fold there execution time. This ensures complete balance when scheduling without any one process being given the advantage over the others. Scheduling with external priorities can not really be compared to the other two, since the assigned priorities to each process is what determines the processes the system will prioritize or in other words will favour. Since the external priority algorithm functions as first come first serve for processes of the same priority, the algorithm can be used to offset some of the bias when it comes to first come first serve by assigning the shorter processes a higher priority. However this would run the risk of the lower priority processes never being able to finish due to continual interrupts. Unfortunately this was not testable due to the limited number of inputs we could produce, as a result no test resulted in an unfinished process.