

Ceph - Documentation #2271

FAQ: BTRFS vs XFS

04/12/2012 04:06 PM - Anonymous

Status: Resolved	% Done: 50%
Priority: Normal	Spent time: 2.00 hours
Assignee: John Wilkins	
Category:	
Target version:	
Tags:	Affected Versions:
Backport:	Pull request ID:
Reviewed:	

Description

I expect others to improve this list, but to start it out ...

what file systems we run on (and test on)

how you can make the right trade-off in deciding which to use

how easy it is to change your decision later

btrfs

how it improves our performance

value (and limitations) of checksumming

observed issues and our expectations

xfs

advantages over btrfs

performance issues vs btrfs, why it has them

ext4

advantages over btrfs

performance issues vs btrfs, why it has them

History

#1 - 04/19/2012 02:11 PM - Sage Weil

- Target version set to v0.47

- translation missing: en.field_position set to 1198

#2 - 04/23/2012 02:19 PM - Sage Weil

- Target version deleted (v0.47)

#3 - 05/23/2012 02:17 PM - John Wilkins

- Category deleted (OSD)

- Status changed from New to In Progress

- % Done changed from 0 to 50

<http://ceph.com/docs/master/rec/filesystem/> still needs some info on how easy it is to change from XFS to btrfs.

#4 - 05/17/2013 12:49 PM - John Wilkins

- Status changed from In Progress to Resolved

This is covered here: <http://ceph.com/docs/master/rados/configuration/filesystem-recommendations/> and has a link from the FAQ.

#5 - 05/17/2013 01:21 PM - Sage Weil

Correction: btrfs is not a journaled fs. The xfs is better than ext4 for subtle desSigns reasons that are probably not worth highlighting.