

Original Article

Adoption of Source Control Systems in the Software Industry

Sudheer Amgothu¹, Giridhar Kankanala²¹Independent Researcher, Department of Computer Science, MA, USA.²Independent Researcher, Department of Computer Science, IL, USA.

Received Date: 15 January 2024

Revised Date: 17 February 2024

Accepted Date: 16 March 2024

Abstract: Source control systems (SCS) have become essential in managing software development projects, enabling teams to efficiently track changes, collaborate, and manage version histories. This paper provides a comprehensive review of the adoption of SCS in the software industry, tracing its evolution from early centralized systems to modern distributed version control systems (DVCS) like Git. We analyze the factors driving the widespread adoption, the challenges faced by teams during migration and daily use, and the benefits of adopting SCS, such as enhanced collaboration, automated workflows, and improved security. We also provide insights into the future of SCS, especially in the context of DevOps, cloud computing, and AI integration. Finally, we offer practical recommendations for organizations transitioning to or optimizing their use of SCS.

Keywords: SCM, GIT, SVM, Jenkins, CiricleCI, GitL abCI.

I. INTRODUCTION

Source control systems play an important role in software development and provide methods for tracking, managing, and changing code changes over time. Initially, development teams relied on manual processes or native systems to manage code versions, which presented challenges such as code rewriting, lack of rollback options, and ineffective cooperation. In response to these problems, early systems such as the Revision Control System (RCS) and the Concurrent Version System (CVS) were developed. These core systems allowed developers to review and evaluate code versions, but they were rarely compiled and simplified. In recent years, distributed version control systems (DVCS), especially Git, have gained popularity due to their simplicity, scalability, and scalability. Much of this change is due to the rise of open-source software, DevOps practices and the increasing complexity of software projects. The main objectives of this paper are:

- To analyze the adoption trends of source control systems in the software industry.
- To identify the benefits and challenges associated with adopting modern DVCS.
- To explore the role of SCS in enabling DevOps and continuous integration/continuous delivery (CI/CD) pipelines.
- To propose future directions for the evolution of source control systems in response to emerging trends in AI, cloud, and security.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews existing literature on SCS and its evolution. Section 3 presents the methodologies used for data collection and analysis. Section 4 discusses case studies of companies that have adopted SCS. Section 5 examines challenges and solutions associated with SCS. Section 6 provides the results of the analysis, followed by a discussion on future trends in Section 7, and concluding remarks in Section 8.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of version control dates to the early days of software development, when the need to track changes in code bases first arose. Early systems such as RCS, CVS, and Subversion (SVN) allowed for centralized version control, where a single repository stored the major version of the code base and developers worked on local outlets. However, centralized systems have many weaknesses, including a lack of offline capability, poor branching support, and difficulty handling large, distributed teams. In the mid-2000s, distributed version control systems (DVCS) such as Git and Mercurial were developed to address these limitations. Git actually revolutionizes version control by allowing developers to work on local versions of a repository, make changes offline, and later sync with the repository. Git's branching and merging capabilities have greatly improved over previous systems.

The transition from centralized to distributed version control systems marked a significant evolution in how teams managed code. Centralized systems, while easier to manage for small teams, presented challenges for large-scale collaboration and concurrent development. DVCS, on the other hand, provided:

- Decentralization: Every developer has a complete copy of the repository, allowing for greater flexibility and resilience.
- Branching and Merging: Git's branching model supports non-linear development, making it easier for teams to work on multiple features or bug fixes simultaneously without disrupting the main codebase.



Modern software development emphasizes automation and continuous integration/continuous delivery (CI/CD). Source control systems are integral to DevOps pipelines, serving as the source of truth for the entire codebase. CI/CD tools like Jenkins, CircleCI, and GitLab CI rely on repositories to trigger automated builds, tests, and deployments. As a result, SCS adoption has grown alongside DevOps practices, particularly in organizations looking to shorten release cycles and improve code quality.

The adoption of Git, particularly through platforms like GitHub and GitLab, has also facilitated the growth of open-source software (OSS). These platforms provide not only version control but also issue tracking, collaboration tools, and CI/CD integration, making them essential for OSS projects with contributors across the globe.

Table 1: SCM Tools Based on their Key Characteristics

SCM Tool	Type	Branching Model	Scalability	Offline Work	Merge Conflicts	Security Features	Popular Use Cases
RCM	Centralized	Limited	Low	No	Complex	Basic File permissions	Small teams, local projects
CVS	Centralized	Limited	Low	No	Difficult	Basic user authentication	Legacy systems, older software
SVN	Centralized	Basic	Moderate	No	Manageable	Role-based access control	Large enterprise, game development
Git	Distributed	Flexible	High	No	Advanced Merging	Basic user authentication	Open-Source projects, enterprises
Perforce	Centralized	Advanced	High	No	Advanced Merging	Role-based authentication	Large enterprises, game development

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Study Design

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data to assess the adoption of SCS in the software industry. A survey was conducted among multiple software developers, engineers, and team leads across various industries. Additionally, in-depth interviews were held with 10 senior engineers responsible for implementing or managing SCS in the organizations.

B. Data Collection

The survey included questions related to:

- The type of SCS used (e.g., Git, SVN, Mercurial).
- The size and structure of the development team.
- The perceived benefits and challenges of SCS adoption.
- The integration of SCS with CI/CD pipelines.

Interview data provided qualitative insights into decision-making processes for adopting or migrating to new SCS, as well as lessons learned during implementation.

C. Data Analysis

Survey responses were analyzed using statistical methods to identify trends in SCS adoption. Regression analysis was used to determine the factors most strongly correlated with successful SCS implementation. Interview data were transcribed and coded thematically to identify common challenges and best practices.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

A. Objective

The objective of the experimental setup is to analyze and benchmark different Source Control Systems (SCS) based on real-world performance metrics such as commit latency, merge conflict resolution, and scalability under high-concurrency scenarios. The experiment aims to assess the impact of various SCS tools in modern CI/CD pipelines and large-scale distributed development environments.

B. Test Environment

a) Hardware Configuration:

- 4 Virtual Machines (VMs) hosted on a cloud platform (AWS EC2 or GCP).
- Each VM equipped with 16 vCPUs, 64GB RAM, and 500GB SSD storage.
- Git, SVN, Perforce, and Mercurial installed on separate VMs for isolation.

b) *Software Stack:*

- OS: Ubuntu 22.04 LTS
- CI/CD Tools: Jenkins, GitLab CI for integration with SCS.
- Monitoring: Prometheus for real-time metrics collection.
- Automation: Ansible used to automate the setup of repositories and configurations.

c) *Dataset:*

- A synthetic dataset of 50,000 commits with varying code sizes and file types (C++, Python, JavaScript).
- Branching structure simulated to represent a real-world development environment where multiple teams work on different features simultaneously.

C. Metrics Measured

- **Commit Latency:** The time taken for each commit to be pushed to the repository, especially under high network load and large commit sizes.
- **Merge Conflict Resolution Time:** The time required to resolve merge conflicts in a distributed system when two or more developers modify the same files.
- **Scalability:** How the system performs under increasing loads (more commits per second, larger teams).
- **Data Consistency:** Ensuring integrity during concurrent writes, with tests for consistency in distributed systems such as Git and Mercurial.
- **Branching Performance:** Time taken to create new branches and merge them back into the main branch.

D. Procedure

a) *Initial Setup:*

A baseline performance test is conducted using an empty repository in each SCS tool to record metrics for basic operations (commits, branch creation, and merge operations).

b) *Load Simulation:*

A set of automated scripts using locust is deployed to simulate multiple developers working concurrently. The scripts simulate:

- A team of 20 developers working on a large project over 4 weeks.
- Frequent branching and merging (every 2 hours) to represent active development cycles.

c) *Integration with CI/CD:*

- Jenkins and GitLab CI pipelines are integrated with the SCS tools to test their performance in handling build triggers after each commit or merge.
- Each commit triggers a build of a large application, adding pressure on the system to measure performance under real-world usage conditions.

d) *Conflict Resolution Simulation:*

A controlled experiment simulates merge conflicts between 5 developers working on the same code section. Conflict resolution time is recorded across Git, SVN, and Mercurial.

V. CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

A. Challenges in SCS Adoption

- **Resistance to Change:** Teams accustomed to centralized systems like SVN or CVS often resist transitioning to newer DVCS like Git due to the learning curve and initial setup complexity.
- **Integration with Existing Tools:** Organizations face difficulties integrating SCS with legacy tools or proprietary CI/CD solutions.
- **Security Concerns:** Ensuring codebase security, especially for cloud-based SCS platforms, is a top concern, with risks including unauthorized access and data leaks.

B. Proposed Solutions

- **Training and Support:** Implementing structured training programs to upskill developers in using advanced features of Git, such as rebasing and conflict resolution.
- **Automation Tools:** Using tools like GitOps to manage infrastructure as code (IaC) and automate deployments through SCS.
- **Enhanced Security Practices:** Employing security features like signed commits, branch protection rules, and role-based access control (RBAC) to secure codebases.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Adoption Benefits

The quantitative analysis of survey responses revealed the following key benefits of adopting source control systems:

- **Improved Collaboration:** 82% of respondents reported that SCS improved team collaboration by enabling multiple developers to work on the same project without conflicts.
- **Code Quality Improvements:** 74% noted that SCS improved code quality through better version tracking and easier rollback options.
- **CI/CD Integration:** 69% of respondents integrated SCS with CI/CD pipelines, resulting in faster release cycles and more efficient automated testing.
- **Commit Latency:** Distributed systems like Git and Mercurial showed lower commit latency compared to centralized systems like SVN, especially when network conditions were unreliable.
- **Merge Conflict Resolution:** Git demonstrated faster conflict resolution due to its advanced merging algorithms and flexible branching model, while SVN and Perforce required more manual intervention.
- **Scalability:** Git and Mercurial scaled well with increasing teams and commit sizes, while centralized systems like SVN experienced bottlenecks with multiple concurrent users.
- **Branching Performance:** Git's lightweight branching model outperformed the other systems in terms of branch creation and merging speed, particularly in large-scale, multi-team environments.

B. Challenges Persist

Despite the benefits, challenges such as resistance to adoption (particularly in legacy environments) and the complexity of Git's branching model remain prevalent.

VII. FUTURE WORK

A. Emerging Trends

- **AI and Automation:** AI-powered tools for automatic code merging, conflict resolution, and even code generation are expected to become integral to SCS workflows.
- **Cloud-Based SCS:** As more organizations migrate to cloud-native environments, SCS systems are increasingly integrated with cloud platforms, enabling seamless collaboration across globally distributed teams.
- **Security Enhancements:** Future developments will likely focus on strengthening the security of SCS, with features like blockchain-based immutability and more granular access control measures.

B. Directions for Further Research

- Investigating the role of SCS in mobile and IoT development environments.
- Exploring the integration of SCS with next-generation DevOps tools that leverage AI for enhanced automation and monitoring.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The use of source control systems has revolutionized software development, allowing teams to manage code more efficiently, collaborate better, and connect seamlessly to CI/CD pipelines. While the challenges of migration, security, and hardware integration remain, the benefits of SCS—especially in terms of collaboration and automation—make it critical to modern software development efforts. As the industry evolves, so do resource management systems by incorporating new technologies such as artificial intelligence and cloud computing to improve their effectiveness.

IX. REFERENCES

- [1] Chacon, S., & Straub, B. (2014). *Pro Git*. Apress.
- [2] Loeliger, J., & McCullough, M. (2012). *Version Control with Git*. O'Reilly Media.
- [3] Spinellis, D. (2005). Version Control Systems. *IEEE Software*, 22(5), 108-109.
- [4] GitHub Documentation. (2024). "GitHub Actions - CI/CD Automation."
- [5] Bass, L., Weber, I., & Zhu, L. (2015). *DevOps: A Software Architect's Perspective*. Addison-Wesley.
- [6] Baker, A., & M. T. (2010). "Version Control Systems: A Study of Their Use in Software Development." *Journal of Software Engineering and Applications*, 3(6), 563-574.
- [7] Spinellis, D. (2005). "Version Control Systems: A Survey." *IEEE Software*, 22(5), 24-30.
- [8] Fowler, M. (2010). "Continuous Integration." Martin Fowler: Bliki.
- [9] D Bashir, M. (2017). "The Impact of Version Control Systems on Software Development." *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 169(5), 36-41.
- [10] Perry, D. E., & Wolf, A. L. (1992). "Foundations for the Study of Software Architecture." *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 17(4), 40-52.