

---

Subject: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Wed, 19 Nov 2008 19:45:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well i got an SSD mtron 3000 in my laptop.

I must say its quick.  
Originally 150 times faster.

Anyone got the same experience?  
SSD r0x

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Wed, 19 Nov 2008 19:51:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SSD sounds very promising, but I'm not going to dive in yet. They really have a small number of read/write cycles before mean failure, and I don't feel like getting something that unreliable for the moment.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 21:21:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My understanding of SSD is that the hard drive spins at full speed/power 100% of the time. Given that, it is fail for laptops because a battery issues. I have heard it is very fast and pretty stable for new technology though.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 21:35:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luv2pb wrote on Thu, 20 November 2008 15:21My understanding of SSD is that the hard drive spins at full speed/power 100% of the time. Given that, it is fail for laptops because a battery issues. I have heard it is very fast and pretty stable for new technology though.

Actually, it's totally solid memory, similar to the cards that are used in a Digital Camera/mp3 player; therefore it doesn't spin at all, which makes them totally 'win' for laptops.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Thu, 20 Nov 2008 21:37:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What happened to those high density drives IBM were putting together in the late 90's. You know, 2GB drives only 1" in length

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 04:45:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luv2pb wrote on Thu, 20 November 2008 15:21My understanding of SSD is that the hard drive spins at full speed/power 100% of the time. Given that, it is fail for laptops because a battery issues. I have heard it is very fast and pretty stable for new technology though. Umm... you're way off, because SSDs don't spin at all. Hence the name "Solid-State Drive".

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 06:14:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

renalpha wrote on Wed, 19 November 2008 13:45Well i got an SSD mtron 3000 in my laptop.

I must say its quick.  
Originally 150 times faster.

Anyone got the same experience?  
SSD r0x

Do they have solid state hardrive for laptops?. I wonder if they are heavier than the ordinary ones it.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [Speedy059](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 09:10:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You silly n00bs and your SCSI's and SSD's...pfff.

Time to get out of the stone age and get one of these puppies:

<http://fusionio.com/Products.aspx> <-- It's like having 1000 SCSI hard drives in your hand

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 17:41:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Speedy059 wrote on Fri, 21 November 2008 03:10 You silly n00bs and your SCSI's and SSD's...pfff.

Time to get out of the stone age and get one of these puppies:

<http://fusionio.com/Products.aspx> <-- It's like having 1000 SCSI hard drives in your hand

That is solid-state.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 18:19:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ssd is indeed a drive which is faster then a normal ide drive.

It is very good for laptops since it hardly uses battery.  
Although it is very expensive (paid 523euro).

Their weight is nothing compared a normal disk.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 18:32:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They're a very good idea for laptops if you move around a lot and have reason to expect that it may be handled roughly, but otherwise you're just throwing away a fuckton of money. Perhaps when the technology matures and gets significantly less expensive it'll be more practical as an upgrade.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 19:43:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wait a year for another price drop, they dropped to around 350 USD from 1000 USD a year ago.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Fri, 21 Nov 2008 23:02:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Speedy059 wrote on Fri, 21 November 2008 03:10 You silly n00bs and your SCSI's and SSD's...pfff.

Time to get out of the stone age and get one of these puppies:

<http://fusionio.com/Products.aspx> <-- It's like having 1000 SCSI hard drives in your hand

Just called yourself a noob... those are SSDs.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Sat, 22 Nov 2008 05:46:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Spin == consuming full power. SSDs do use less power, but it's a constant drain as opposed to hard drives which use full power during spin, but when not spinning use very little.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [\\_SSnipe\\_](#) on Sat, 22 Nov 2008 08:01:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So its like a hard drive card?

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sat, 22 Nov 2008 08:34:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My mother has an 4GB SSD in her EEEPC which I installed XP on. It loads faster then any desktop I have and the boot time was 1/2 bars. Reading times of SSD are great, hence why they are used primary as boot disks right now. More files and database apps are not really that faster yet. It's just waiting for better SSD. And also Intel has one of the fastest for consumer I think. My next Laptop will include and SSD though.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Sat, 22 Nov 2008 10:35:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The main downsides to SSD's at the moment are the higher price and lower number of write/erase cycles before they fail, slower writing time (depends on model, but generally slower than an equivilent HDD) and lower capacity.

On the up side, they are a lot faster than HDDs for random reads, have no moving mechanical

parts which may fail and make no noise when in use.

Personally, I will be sticking with HDDs for the foreseeable future, but once SSDs start to mature I will certainly consider them, probably initially in an SSD / HDD combination where the SSD contains the OS and application installations (for fast loading) and the HDD contains the pagefile, documents, media, project files etc etc.

Oh, and a word of advice to anyone using an SSD: Disable the pagefile, or move it to a HDD instead. The pagefile is constantly written and modified while Windows is running and this causes your finite number of write/erase cycles on your SSD to be used up much faster than normal.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [Gen\\_Blacky](#) on Sun, 23 Nov 2008 05:07:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

no money so sata 2.0 all the way

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc  
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sun, 23 Nov 2008 10:44:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

danpaul88 wrote on Sat, 22 November 2008 05:35 The main downsides to SSD's at the moment are the higher price and lower number of write/erase cycles before they fail, slower writing time (depends on model, but generally slower than an equivalent HDD) and lower capacity.

On the up side, they are a lot faster than HDDs for random reads, have no moving mechanical parts which may fail and make no noise when in use.

Personally, I will be sticking with HDDs for the foreseeable future, but once SSDs start to mature I will certainly consider them, probably initially in an SSD / HDD combination where the SSD contains the OS and application installations (for fast loading) and the HDD contains the pagefile, documents, media, project files etc etc.

Oh, and a word of advice to anyone using an SSD: Disable the pagefile, or move it to a HDD instead. The pagefile is constantly written and modified while Windows is running and this causes your finite number of write/erase cycles on your SSD to be used up much faster than normal.

OMG YOU ARE ONE OF THE NOB

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc

Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Sun, 23 Nov 2008 10:57:56 GMT

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

---

Gen\_Blacky wrote on Sun, 23 November 2008 05:07no money so sata 2.0 all the way

SATA is an interface, not a drive type, and is infact the interface that a lot of SSDs on the market today use.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc

Posted by [Gen\\_Blacky](#) on Sun, 23 Nov 2008 18:34:14 GMT

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

---

danpaul88 wrote on Sun, 23 November 2008 04:57Gen\_Blacky wrote on Sun, 23 November 2008 05:07no money so sata 2.0 all the way

SATA is an interface, not a drive type, and is infact the interface that a lot of SSDs on the market today use.

yea, i was just saying i wont use ssd for a while.

---

---

Subject: Re: SSD vs sata etc

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Sun, 23 Nov 2008 18:54:07 GMT

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

---

luv2pb wrote on Thu, 20 November 2008 15:21My understanding of SSD is that the hard drive spins at full speed/power 100% of the time. Given that, it is fail for laptops because a battery issues. I have heard it is very fast and pretty stable for new technology though.

The new port S.A.T.A. all the way it is much better and faster than the original I.D.E. which is just slow.

---