

We can see that allocation policy affects page fault rate and EAT. EAT is affected due to replacement also being affected, therefore indirectly affecting frequency of TLB entries being removed. In the example testdata, both PFRs of FIFO Global is less than FIFO local, yet EAT is only smaller in process B. The difference of replacement policies are less significant, some of the values are even identical. The only difference is on process B when using LOCAL, we can see that CLOCK isn't necessarily better than. It has a greater EAT and a less PFR.

In general, CLOCK is better than FIFO, since it's a LRU approximation. However, in the worst case, CLOCK still degrades to FIFO, with more search time than FIFO.

#### RESULT :

##### FIFO\_GLOBAL

Process A, Effective Access Time = 164.758

Process A, Page Fault Rate : 0.723

Process B, Effective Access Time = 163.709

Process B, Page Fault Rate : 0.665

##### FIFO\_LOCAL

Process A, Effective Access Time = 164.980

Process A, Page Fault Rate : 0.774

Process B, Effective Access Time = 163.144

Process B, Page Fault Rate : 0.700

##### CLOCK\_GLOBAL

Process A, Effective Access Time = 164.758

Process A, Page Fault Rate : 0.723

Process B, Effective Access Time = 163.709

Process B, Page Fault Rate : 0.665

##### CLOCK\_LOCAL

Process A, Effective Access Time = 164.980

Process A, Page Fault Rate : 0.774

Process B, Effective Access Time = 163.522

Process B, Page Fault Rate : 0.694