

Re: Disk Scanning & Defragmentation

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2008-08/msg04979.html>

- *From:* "Twayne" <nobody@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 29 Aug 2008 19:19:27 -0400
-

Nah, perish the thought of my trying to say anything doesn't play a role in ... whatever. It's all connected of course and as soon as you try to say always or never, the gremlins and Murphys will come scrambling in from every orifice and totally negate any recent well intentioned allegations<g>.

As you say, it's all generalizations unless we're lucky enough to work in a lab that specializes in such things or at least have access to some of their records, many of which are questionable at best anyway. Actually, if you've ever disassembled any hard drives carefully enough, it's amazing the heads manage to live as long as they do, buried in amongst the flying platters and all with what appears at least to me, to be very flimsy physical structures. At least the magnets are a blast to play with<g>!

I agree with everything you said; no argument at all in any way. I think my reaction was more to the point that the discussion seemed to be assuming that there was only that one single failure mechanism that meant anything and I wanted to point out that it wasn't going to go anywhere useful;

As for mr unknown, or ms, whatever it may be, some just feel a need to grasp for their lack of power in the relatively safe ether of the 'net. There's quite a mix of ego, personality and covert power plays on the groups but they're mostly harmless beings<g>.

Cheers,

Twayne

Thanks for the elucidation, but it seems to me that you're just describing the ways in which disks wear out. Are you claiming that the amount of use, specifically the amount of head movement, does not play any role in causing at least some of those issues to arise, subsequently leading to failure? Speaking, here, of disks that aren't essentially DOA? Ones that have been in use for some time? I would imagine that bearing failure or seals gone bad would lead to the

Re: Disk Scanning & Defragmentation

highest proportion of failures, failures that could derive from simply idling for five years or whatever, but other types of failure surely derive from actual use, as opposed to spinning idly, do they not?

Of course I was making a generalization, as was everyone else in the thread except Unknown, who has developed a hobby that consists of seeing if he can catch me in an error. He is often in error and I feel it's my responsibility to correct those errors, which had caused him to develop resentment, etc.

"Twayne" <nobody@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:%23HjZELfCJHA.2060@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

There's a balance to be struck. Of course a heavily fragmented disk will endure more wear, but overuse of defrag will do the same.

And of course fewer disks wear out due to excessive defragging. It's more the opposite. The vast majority of them are of the first type -- not enough defragging, rather than too much. But that doesn't make my statement ridiculous. It's a true statement.

In reality there are so many other variables involved in these scenarios that generalizations can be made but that's about all. I seriously doubt the two camps here actually cover the reality of disk failure. One would be hard pressed to even get empirical evidence of either case. In my experience the reasons for disk failures have ranged from worn out bearings to dust (broken seals) to a platter's head failure to head misalignments due to rough handling, to ... you name it. Then that takes you into areas such as whether it's best to leave the disk spinning or shut it down during periods of non-use, etc. etc. etc.. I've never seen one that indicated the problem was attributed to excessive head movement of any kind where the head just wasn't able to move; something you can easily hear in nearly 100% of the drives ever made. Not trying to do an ego boost for myself here; just trying to indicate that it's sort of a moot point about defrag or not from a mechanical viewpoint. As long as the hermetic seal remains in tact, there should be little to wear out except for grease moving out of its intended place and not getting used, which IME has always been what crashes disks early in their lives. Somewhere I have a white paper on this from some lab but I can't find it now of course!

Cheers,

Re: Disk Scanning & Defragmentation

Twayne

"Unknown" <unknown@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:EqBtk.19431\\$jI5.568@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:EqBtk.19431$jI5.568@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

That is an absolutely ridiculous statement.
Granted, disks wear
out. However, as a product, they have a life
expectancy.

If a disk fails chances are it won't be because
of defragging. Did

it ever occur to you that there could be
MORE wear if it is NOT

defragged? "Gary S. Terhune" <none> wrote
in message

news:uTcPTxJCJHA.1184@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

The joke doesn't apply.
Unnecessary defragging will
simply wear
the disk out faster for no
good reason.

--

Gary S. Terhune
MS-MVP Shell/User
<http://grystmill.com>

"HeyBub"

<heybub@xxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in message

news:OcpUStJCJHA.2476@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Penorama

wrote:

I've
been
told
during
Windows
98
days
that
it's
good
to
run

Re: Disk Scanning & Defragmentation

Scandisk
and
Defragmentation
regularly
to
keep
the
computer
spick
and
span.
Does
it
still
apply
to
these
days
of
Windows
XP
and
Vista?
As
a
matter
of
fact
I
carry
out
these
maintenance
measures
every
week,
but
would
like
to
know
their
relevance
in
the
present
day
software
environment.

Re: Disk Scanning & Defragmentation

[Joke
shortened]

Doctor is
leaning over
a fallen
actor on the
stage of a
Yiddish
theater
around the
turn of the
last century.

From the
back of the
balcony, a
Yiddisha-mama
voice cries
out:
"Give him
an enema!"

The doctor
stands and
shouts back:
"Madam,
the actor is
dead!"

Same voice
from the
balcony, a
bit more
sheepishly:
"So, it can't
hurt."