

William Luttmann

Mark Boady

CS 571 Advanced Programming Techniques

August 25, 2020

Research Report 2 Review : Will Schick

The first thing I want to mention about this paper is that the title is a great pun that definitely got a laugh from me. The introduction sets up a good use case for the company TradEdit. It draws the reader into an example of a platform's worst nightmare where a large portion of work is lost in a very short period of time. Then, it makes the argument of a solution which needs to satisfy a few requirements that would most benefit the company. The second paragraph opens with some interesting facts about how Git got its name. It goes on to explain what version control software is and how it works. This was well thought out and used terminology that is easily understood by some with a less technical background. The next paragraph explains how TradEdit was previously managing their code without any version control software. This paragraph highlights how not using Git can really cause problems internally. It forces the reader to understand why some problems can snowball without Git, pushing the bias and the point of the paper into the reader's mind. Now, it is introduced how Git is implemented and what it can do to promote productivity and collaboration across programming teams. The last point that is made is that GitLab's plan is the right fit for the company. GitLab will be used because TradEdit does not have the resources to keep up to date with security and patches internally. This flavor of Git is also being chosen as is cheaper than the other alternative, Github Enterprise. This paragraph is a little short and probably could have

more information backing up as to why GitLab is best choice for the company. The conclusion restates the main point and reminds the reader that a Git implementation will fix and alternatively eliminate collaboration problems. Overall, the positives are that the report communicates the point and provides the reader with some interesting facts with good use of vocabulary. Negatives are that the report was more on the short side and could have been expanded on different areas with support from additional sources.