

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: paging file necessary or not ?

Re: paging file necessary or not ?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics/2005-03/0087.html>

From: Rick \ (rick_at_mvps.org)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 06:09:51 -0500

Why the 7GB partitions for dual booting?

--

Best of Luck,

Rick Rogers, aka "Nutcase" - Microsoft MVP

<http://mvp.support.microsoft.com/>

Associate Expert - WindowsXP Expert Zone

www.microsoft.com/windowsxp/expertzone

Windows help - www.rickrogers.org

"plb2862" <plb2862@cox.net> wrote in message

news:P_vUd.27779\$Tt.16466@fedlread05...

> Over a year now and no failures and no speed issues, It must be a fluke
> although the point of having 2MB on each of the partitions helps in
> keeping the system from crashing. It took a lot of research to find this
> solution. And what I'm left with is a primary partition that can handle
> all (without going over 7GB - so I can dual boot) of my OS primary
> programs without slowing the system down. In my case it works and is
> efficient and that may be because this system does Office documents and
> e-mail and not any intense graphic manipulation.

>

> "Rick "Nutcase" Rogers" <rick@mvps.org> wrote in message

> news:uAQaLjQHFHA.560@TK2MSFTNGP12.phx.gbl...

>> While I won't disagree with your suggestion, you should be aware that
>> placing the pagefile on a different volume on the same drive can be an
>> issue if paging is heavy. A lot of paging will cause excessive drive head
>> movement as it jumps back and forth between the paging volume and the
>> boot volume. If paging is light, or relatively non-existent, then this
>> won't be a problem. I'm not sure how it would react to a memory dump on
>> system failure.

>>

>> --

>> Best of Luck,

>>

>> Rick Rogers, aka "Nutcase" - Microsoft MVP

>> <http://mvp.support.microsoft.com/>

>> Associate Expert - WindowsXP Expert Zone

>> www.microsoft.com/windowsxp/expertzone

>> Windows help - www.rickrogers.org

>>

>> "plb2862" <plb2862@cox.net> wrote in message

>> news:%alUd.24047\$Tt.23229@fedlread05...

>> Pagefile is necessary. However, size is arbitrary with at least a minimum
>> of 2MB and windows XP has adjusted mine when I set it too low. Usually,
>> it is set to 2 MB minimum and 1½ times Physical RAM. Some suggestions
>> are 1½ to 3 times Physical RAM. In your case minimum could be 2 MB or

Re: paging file necessary or not ?

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: paging file necessary or not ?

```
>> 768 x 1½ = 1152 MB or maximum could be 768 x 1½ = 1152 MB or 768 x 3 =
>> 2304 MB. Personally, I don't use this general guide that is documented in
>> MS KB and other sources. I have 512 MB and I set my minimum and maximum
>> to 768 MB. All-be-it, I don't do severe processing (large graphic file
>> processing) and I monitor my pagefile using a utility called pagemon.exe
>> I only use approximately 33% - about 252 MB at the peak use. If you do a
>> lot of intensive graphics manipulation, you need at least 1GB Physical
>> RAM and I would also set the pagefile.sys to the recommended 1½ to 3
>> times Physical RAM. I know you have a bad memory slot but, if you needed
>> to could you up the DIMMs on the slots you have (2-512MB DIMMS)? Here is
>> another technique that some MVPs won't agree with. On my 38GB HD I have
>> C:, D:, E:, F:, G:, (7GB each) and H: (3GB) partitions. I put a 2MB
>> pagefile on each C: - F: partition and 760 MB on the H: partition which
>> is totally dedicated to pagefile.sys with a little extra space. Some may
>> want to know why 7GB on the partitions which has to do with future dual
>> boot restrictions. The 3GB final partition is large enough to expand the
>> pagefile.sys to 3 times the Physical RAM.
>>
>> "brugnosspamsia" <brugnosspamsia@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
>> news:ThhUd.24409$8B3.4978@text.news.blueyonder.co.uk...
>>> Dear group,
>>>
>>> I was in the process of advising a colleague on how much RAM she needed
>>> in
>>> her new PC.
>>>
>>> I have a system with an Athlon 1.33GHz processor and 768 MBytes of
>>> 266MHz
>>> DDR RAM.
>>> (I originally fitted a whole GByte but one of my RAM slots turned out to
>>> be
>>> faulty.)
>>>
>>> I have been having performance issues when running Google Desktop Search
>>> and
>>> AVG antivirus.
>>> (delays when clicking on shortcuts etc)
>>>
>>> I realise now I don't understand the meaning of the "memory meter" in
>>> task
>>> manager (as well as just about everything else !)
>>>
>>> It ocured to me that my XP Pro might have configured itself to suit
>>> outdated expectations of hardware and might be unnecessarilly using
>>> clunky
>>> hard drive instead of speedy RAM.
>>>
>>> Having now just set the paging file size to zero, I find the performance
>>> has
>>> improved significantly and the PF Usage meter now never exceeds
>>> 512MBytes no
>>> matter how hard I push the machine .....
>>>
>>> Is there a way to make Windows take full advantage of all my RAM or any
>>> more I choose to fit ?
>>> (RAM disk perhaps) Or can I give my spare 256MBytes away ?
>>>
>>> thanks...
>>>
>>> Jeremy
>>>
>>>
```

microsoft.public.windowsxp.basics: Re: paging file necessary or not ?

>>
>>
>
>