

---

Subject: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 04:46:06 GMT

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

---

I have about 4 years old computer with two partitions.  
One is C - 26.6GB and D 26.9GB.

Both partitions are in Fat32, but I was thinking about converting the C (system) partition to NTFS.

I red on the NTFS website that NTFS performance is worse on small volumes, and better on large volumes. Now if I could only find out what they mean by "small" volumes. To me 26GB seems petty small so I guess I probably won't get any benefits.  
But I just wanted to hear peoples opinions.

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [\\_SSnipe\\_](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 05:05:41 GMT

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

---

Terminator 101 wrote on Tue, 16 June 2009 21:46 I have about 4 years old computer with two partitions.

One is C - 26.6GB and D 26.9GB.

Both partitions are in Fat32, but I was thinking about converting the C (system) partition to NTFS.

I red on the NTFS website that NTFS performance is worse on small volumes, and better on large volumes. Now if I could only find out what they mean by "small" volumes. To me 26Gb seems petty small so I guess I probably won't get any benefits.

But I just wanted to hear peoples opinions.

If I remember right its true, but 26 gb is kinda big so idk

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 05:21:40 GMT

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

---

FAT32 is also limited to a maximum file size of 4GB as far as I know, so if you're storing big files like DVD's, you'll likely need to use NTFS.

I doubt there will be a huge speed difference anyways.

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [DeadX07](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 05:57:06 GMT

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

---

It 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

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 07:06:48 GMT

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

---

I wouldn't bother with the effort, unless you need to start storing files that are bigger than 4GB, as FAT32 has a maximum filesize.

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 13:10:04 GMT

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

---

DeadX07 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.

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [TD](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 14:12:06 GMT

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

---

I have another PC with two partitions totalling ~80gb, and the filesystem I've used since I bought it years ago is NTFS.

I say, if you got free time and you are bored, go ahead and try formatting it to NTFS.

---

---

Subject: Re: convert to NTFS or not?

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Wed, 17 Jun 2009 15:20:45 GMT

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

---

EvilWhiteDragon 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.

---

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".

---