**Discussion**

**5.1 Discussion Methodology**

After collecting and analysing the data provided by the real and pseudorandom generators sampled, the final step was to evaluate each implementation’s overall performance. As well as these individual evaluations, where possible the generators were compared to each other, since another aim of the investigation was to attempt to identify which generators performed better than others. A key point that was considered during this discussion was made in Section 4.9, in which it was stated that when reviewing all the test data gathered and attempting to compare suitable generators the datasets able to not necessarily outperform but remain constantly effective across many tests should be considered the more effective solutions.

**5.2 C# Evaluation**

The C# implementations were broken down into two main categories: the Rand functions and the Cryptographic function. The Rand implementations, both seeded and unseeded, performed well in the dice, coin, and card simulations which showed that the generators effectiveness remained relatively unaffected by input and output limitations. During Chi-Squared testing, all the Rand implementation datasets ranked between the desired distribution ranges, with the dice simulation data performing just slightly better than the coin simulation data. When producing shuffled deck data, the distribution of suits for both implementations was acceptable, with most groups being between two or three cards large. None of these tests presented any clear weighting or favoured outputs within the functions. During each of the dealing tests, the hands provided aligned with the expected odds of a poker deck, with the most common hands being High Card or Pairs. The distribution of values, seen for instance in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, with the numeric sequence Rand datasets followed the expected trend of pseudorandom data and while never being the top performers in any of the tests conducted, both the seeded and unseeded Rand implementations consistently passed. Unfortunately, the same couldn’t be said about the Cryptographic implementation which performed poorly in many of the numeric sequence tests conducted. Despite this however, it is still believed that the function can produce a valid pseudorandom sequence and the main issue presented by the tests was that they weren’t designed for the cryptographically secure sequences being produced. The purpose of such a function is to offer the user a non-reproducible collection of bits that can be used for encryption, not a mass-produced collection of values simulating randomness.

**5.3 Python Evaluation**

Python provided two different options for pseudorandom generation, default Rand and NumPy. Both performed well in the simulation tests, achieving sufficiently random results and a sufficiently random distribution of shuffled cards. In the poker and Texas Hold ‘Em distribution tests, both the Python and NumPy implementations provided a likely variety of hands, featuring Three and Four of a Kind. In the numeric sequence tests both implementations performed very well, with all showing an expected trend in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and achieving the closest P-values to the optimal 0.5 in the Serial, Gap, Runs, and Serial Correlation tests. This is counterbalanced however by a poor performance by the Rand functions in the Birthday Spacings test and low test statistics for NumPy in the Serial Correlation test. Seeding also played a more significant role in the Python implementations than in the C# implementations, often with a large difference between values depending on the seed provided to the algorithms.

**5.4 JavaScript Evaluation**

Testing began poorly for JavaScript, with anomalous frequencies of dice outcomes and an unsuitable Chi-Squared statistic. However, this method improved in further tests with far more expected values in the coin simulation. The trend seen in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was as expected. Although the dataset featured no standout performances, and the generator lacks any ability to alter the seed used, almost all JavaScript results were above average. In tests such as the Serial Correlation and Gap, the dataset was among the top performing implementations. While the results of testing indicated that limitations on output can notably affect performance and the generator performs less effectively than Python, JavaScript can still be considered a valid pseudorandom number generator for most commercial projects, although its use in a scientific environment wouldn’t be recommended.

**5.5 Random.org Evaluation**