

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 17:23:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Terminator 101 wrote on Wed, 17 June 2009 17:20EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 17 June 2009 09:10DeadX07 wrote on Wed, 17 June 2009 07:57It depends on how large of files you work with on a regular basis. For the most part, you will see actually a performance loss from FAT32, because NTFS is bloated with its binding to security features and permissions. However, if you know what you're doing you can play with the cluster allocation size when you create the partition, and you may see minimal performance gains.

The main reason you would want to go to NTFS is if you have a larger hard disk, and wish to use security permissions for files and folders on that disk. Otherwise, just stay with FAT32

The fact that NTFS is a journaled filesystem should be enough reason to prefer it over FAT.

Journaled filesystems have the (BIG) advantage that if for ex. your computer would experience powerloss during writing to the disk, your files will have a way lower chance to get damaged/disappear forever.

Unless you're running Win98 and/or linux, there is no reason to have any FAT partition.

Interesting, but like my computer is a laptop with batteries, I don't think I should worry about a power loss.

However, thanks for the information.

I don't think I am going work with files larger than 4GB since this computer does not have DVD burner.

A computercrash may have the same consequences, so be warned. Also, ever since I started using NTFS (in 2002 or so, on a P3 with 20 GB HDD space) I've never seen any reason to go back to FAT32, except for MacOSX or Linux compatibility.

Anyway, you don't need to reformat to switch to NTFS, at least not when running Windows XP or higher. It has a commandline convert tool. You can use it by opening commandprompt, and then typing "convert <volumename (C:)> /FS:NTFS".

---