

## 1 Quercus Component

1.
  - c) code
  - d) heap memory
2.
  - a) number of links to this inode
  - c) type of file system object
  - d) file size
  - f) array of pointers to blocks
3.
  - a) blkck bitmap
  - b) inode
  - c) data block
4. b) data block bitmap

## 2 Markus Component

1. a) Algorithm A would complete faster.

- We are only moving the used blocks to free blocks
- It doesn't have to be concerned with finding related but scattered data blocks
  - Since it's not finding it, the total rotational delay time and seek time is low

On the other hand Algorithm B has to find all data blocks scattered across the disk, and to make relevant data blocks contiguous, it has to move other blocks around. Finding each block adds seek and rotational delay time, and moving further adds the day. In total, the delay time is much larger than algorithm A.

- b) Algorithm B would lead to better performance.

The reason is that

- For, algorithm A, the data blocks to a file are placed more randomly
  - the hard disk drive still has to move its arms to find all related data blocks
    - \* This adds rotational delay and seek time
- For algorithm B, the data blocks to a file are placed contiguously
  - Then, we can write that the data blocks to a file are placed on current or nearby tracks.
  - Since data blocks are placed on current or nearby tracks, it requires little or no movement for disk arm
  - It follows from above that rotational delay and seek time are kept to minimum

- c) **What changes, if any, are made to the inodes? Explain your answer.**

- time modified, time accessed
  - time modified because data blocks are repositioned
  - time accessed because file has to be read in order to find its data blocks for defragmentation
- the value of pointers to indirect blocks and data blocks
  - Is because under the defragmentation algorithm, data blocks and indirect blocks are moved so they are located in contiguously. This changes block address. This change needs to be reflected in inode.