

Re: Alter table command vs table copy/rename

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.programming/2009-06/msg01229.html>

- *From:* bpdee <bpdee@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 17 Jun 2009 07:37:01 -0700
-

Yes, sp_rename is also used. I guess the problem that some people had is altering a table that is quite large in terms of the number of rows in the table is quite slow.

"Uri Dimant" wrote:

Do you refer to sp_rename system stored procedure as well ? With ALTER TABLE.... some operations may take some time and slowdown the database especially while users work on that table, so creating a new table and then rename makes sense under some circumstance...

"bpdee" <bpdee@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message <news:76FE4F74-1402-40BD-B88B-E458148BB018@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Hi,

Does anyone know what the pros and cons are of doing an alter table statement rather than copy/rename table method to make table changes? For years now, we have a product where the way they make schema changes is by copying the table, rebuilding a table with the change like adding a new column, bring the data back in, and then renaming the table back to the original name. They were told that altering the table causes a roll through all of the rows in a table once for each new column being added to the table and that this is extremely slow. It seems that it's better to do an alter table statement rather than the copy/rename method.

Thanks,
Dee

Re: Alter table command vs table copy/rename