Before any changes:

 Defere any changes.						
A	2	ሞ ፒሮ៥∇ <u>'</u>				
E	lem	nent ^	Class, %	Method, %	Line, %	Branch, %
×	6	nl.tudelft.jpacman	14% (8/55)	10% (34/312)	9% (107/1141)	5% (27/539)
		board	20% (2/10)	9% (5/53)	9% (14/141)	1% (1/96)
	>	fuzzer	0% (0/1)	0% (0/6)	0% (0/32)	0% (0/8)
	>	game	0% (0/3)	0% (0/14)	0% (0/37)	0% (0/14)
	>	integration	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/6)	100% (0/0)
	>	level	15% (2/13)	10% (8/78)	6% (23/348)	2% (4/167)
		■ npc	0% (0/10)	0% (0/47)	0% (0/233)	0% (0/116)
	>	points	0% (0/2)	0% (0/7)	0% (0/19)	0% (0/4)
	>	sprite	66% (4/6)	46% (21/45)	54% (70/128)	33% (22/66)
	>	© ui	0% (0/6)	0% (0/31)	0% (0/123)	0% (0/60)
		(b) Launcher	0% (0/1)	0% (0/21)	0% (0/41)	0% (0/6)
		© LauncherSmokeTest	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/29)	0% (0/2)
		PacmanConfigurationException	0% (0/1)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/4)	100% (0/0)

After testCollidedWithGhost:

′				
Element ^	Class, %	Method, %	Line, %	Branch, %
∨ inl.tudelft.jpacman	27% (15/55)	14% (46/312)	12% (140/1	5% (30/563)
> le board	20% (2/10)	9% (5/53)	9% (14/141)	1% (1/96)
> 🗈 fuzzer	0% (0/1)	0% (0/6)	0% (0/32)	0% (0/8)
> in game	0% (0/3)	0% (0/14)	0% (0/43)	0% (0/14)
> integration	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/6)	100% (0/0)
> i level	30% (4/13)	14% (11/78)	9% (34/351)	2% (4/167)
>	40% (4/10)	12% (6/47)	7% (17/240)	0% (1/140)
> in points	50% (1/2)	14% (1/7)	5% (1/20)	0% (0/4)
> 🖻 sprite	66% (4/6)	51% (23/45)	57% (74/12	36% (24/66)
>	0% (0/6)	0% (0/31)	0% (0/123)	0% (0/60)
© Launcher	0% (0/1)	0% (0/21)	0% (0/41)	0% (0/6)
© LauncherSmokeTest	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/29)	0% (0/2)
PacmanConfigurationException	0% (0/1)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/4)	100% (0/0)

After testConsumedPellet:

a 不 T 区 ビ V,				
Element ^	Class, %	Method, %	Line, %	Branch, %
∨	27% (15/55)	15% (48/312)	12% (143/1	5% (30/563)
> 🖻 board	20% (2/10)	9% (5/53)	9% (14/141)	1% (1/96)
> la fuzzer	0% (0/1)	0% (0/6)	0% (0/32)	0% (0/8)
> 🖻 game	0% (0/3)	0% (0/14)	0% (0/43)	0% (0/14)
> integration	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/6)	100% (0/0)
> level	30% (4/13)	15% (12/78)	9% (35/351)	2% (4/167)
>	40% (4/10)	12% (6/47)	7% (17/240)	0% (1/140)
> i points	50% (1/2)	28% (2/7)	15% (3/20)	0% (0/4)
> 🗈 sprite	66% (4/6)	51% (23/45)	57% (74/12	36% (24/66)
>	0% (0/6)	0% (0/31)	0% (0/123)	0% (0/60)
© Launcher	0% (0/1)	0% (0/21)	0% (0/41)	0% (0/6)
◯ LauncherSmokeTest	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/29)	0% (0/2)
PacmanConfigurationException	0% (0/1)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/4)	100% (0/0)

After testPacManMoved:

Element A			ient A	Cidss, /o	wethou, /	Lille, /	bidiicii, /⁄
ŀ	~	٦	nl.tudelft.jpacman	27% (15/55)	15% (49/312)	12% (144/1	5% (30/563)
		>	board	20% (2/10)	9% (5/53)	9% (14/141)	1% (1/96)
		>	fuzzer	0% (0/1)	0% (0/6)	0% (0/32)	0% (0/8)
		>	game	0% (0/3)	0% (0/14)	0% (0/43)	0% (0/14)
		>	integration	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/6)	100% (0/0)
		>		30% (4/13)	15% (12/78)	9% (35/351)	2% (4/167)
		>	□ npc	40% (4/10)	12% (6/47)	7% (17/240)	0% (1/140)
		>	points	50% (1/2)	42% (3/7)	20% (4/20)	0% (0/4)
		>	sprite	66% (4/6)	51% (23/45)	57% (74/128)	36% (24/66)
		>	© ui	0% (0/6)	0% (0/31)	0% (0/123)	0% (0/60)
			© Launcher	0% (0/1)	0% (0/21)	0% (0/41)	0% (0/6)
			C LauncherSmokeTest	0% (0/1)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/29)	0% (0/2)
			PacmanConfigurationException	0% (0/1)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/4)	100% (0/0)

```
@Test
void testCollidedWithGhost(){
    myCalculator.collidedWithAGhost(myPacMan, pinky);
    assertThat(myPacMan.getScore()).isEqualTo( expected: 0);
// let player start with 0 points
@Test
void testConsumedPellet(){
    myCalculator.consumedAPellet(myPacMan, myPellet);
    assertThat(myPacMan.getScore()).isEqualTo(myPellet.getValue());
// let player start with 0 points
// if the player moves in any direction then they should not gain points
@Test
void testPacManMoved(){
    myCalculator.pacmanMoved(myPacMan, myDirection1);
    myCalculator.pacmanMoved(myPacMan, myDirection2);
    myCalculator.pacmanMoved(myPacMan, myDirection3);
    myCalculator.pacmanMoved(myPacMan, myDirection4);
    assertThat(myPacMan.getScore()).isEqualTo( expected: 0);
```

Are the coverage results from JaCoCo similar to the ones you got from IntelliJ in the last task? Why so or why not?

The results are very similar, but JaCoCo seemed to not pick up on some abstract classes such as board. Unit or board. Square.

Did you find helpful the source code visualization from JaCoCo on uncovered branches?

I don't think that the visualization from JaCoCo was any better than the visualization from IntelliJ. It may have been prettier, but I don't think it helped me determine where any test cases should have gone over the way IntelliJ does it.

Which visualization did you prefer and why? IntelliJ's coverage window or JaCoCo's report?

I preferred the IntelliJ's coverage window because it was built into the code editor and was able to show me where there needed to be test coverage in the same application that I am writing the

tests with. Which for me is a plus considering that I don't have to switch tabs to see where tests need to be.