

CSE 464 - HW 3 Phase 2

Bhavya Patel - ASU ID: 1225740997

A)

The summary communicates the core failure but is long, mixes multiple features, and would be stronger if focused and within ~50–70 characters. The description explains the user impact and references an attachment and a related issue, which are helpful cues for scope and motivation. Replication entry points are under-specified and are the report's main weakness. The reporter mentions where the problem was found, but does not provide a clear, numbered, step-by-step sequence for replication. A developer would have to guess which fields to test. The tone is professional.

B)

Replication was not performed in this report, but additional steps for replication are necessary. Open Writer, navigate to File → New → Labels → Format, enter a pitch of 0.625 inches, save/apply, and observe whether the UI rounds to 0.63 and whether the printed layout drifts. These should be enumerated, including what the program displays after each step.

C)

There are several follow-up tests that would make this bug report more complete:

1. Verify for other units: A follow-up test should check if this is an inches-only limitation or a general precision problem. The tester should change the unit to centimeters, millimeters, or points to confirm whether the precision limit is inches-only as claimed in the title, thereby establishing scope across measurement systems.
2. Test fractional inputs: A useful test would be to test inputs like $\frac{2}{7}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, and $\frac{1}{16}$ to see if rounding is consistent across controls and whether layout or print output is affected, broadening coverage of the same suspected underlying fault.
3. Output Test: Try both direct typing of more than two decimals and incremental controls to see if the input method affects stored precision. Then, verify print-to-PDF vs. physical print alignment to assess the severity of label use cases, which test whether the misalignment appears only on screen or also affects the printed output.

D)

Yes, the report includes some speculation, and the report suggests "allow four decimal places AND/OR in options somewhere allow the selection for accuracy" is constructive. This speculation is useful as it provides the development team with a clear picture of a user-acceptable solution. It moves beyond just stating a problem and proposes a fix.

The evaluation is well-founded as it presents a realistic solution while maintaining a respectful tone and avoiding any blame. The report states that "The rounding to two places is not accurate enough for some common applications, chiefly labels...". This is an evaluation of the bug's impact. This is highly appropriate and useful because it is directly supported by factual evidence, i.e, the attached image. It explains why the developers should care about this rounding.