# ECE 421 Assignment 4 Part 3

Wi	nte	r20	19_	Gr	ou	<b>p4</b> :

Nathan	Klapstein	(1449872)

Tony Qian (1396109)

Thomas Lorincz (1461567)

Zach Drever (1446384)

# **Table of Contents**

Summary of Functional Deviations	2
Computer Opponent	2
Game Board	2
Concrete Test Cases	3

# **Summary of Functional Deviations**

## AppModel

#### **CPU vs CPU Mode**

In the course of building the CPU player, we have selected not to have a CPU vs. CPU player mode as an option in the main app menu. While this game type is possible to implement with our architecture, it did not seem useful to include it because it does not demo well (game is played in an instant) and this mode did not help our contract-based test cases.

### **Computer Opponent**

#### Component of AppModel

Our AppModel integrates CPU player capabilities in a extensible manner that is easily added to our game. We chose to include the CPU as part of the AppModel because the game logic was also included in the AppModel. Having our CPU player close to the game logic made building the Al more intuitive to build.

#### **Variable Difficulty**

Our AI player works with a simple yet effective strategy. It first tries to find a move which may win the game, and plays that if possible. Otherwise, it will try to find a move in which the enemy player may win the game, and block that if possible. Lastly, if it was not able to calculate either effective moves, our AI finds the next best move which may help them win the game earliest, and plays that. Our app implements one difficulty as it is representative of how the majority of people would play Connect 4. We chose to spend time trying to build a challenging AI opponent rather than variable difficulties, and time constraints stopped us from adding the variable difficulty functionality later.

#### Game Board

#### Support for a CLI

We now also support the ability to play Connect 4 and Toot and Otto on the command line. The decision to build out this functionality was made because of our use of the MVP design pattern. The CLI could be treated as a new View that will subscribe to the same observer pattern that the GUI-based View does. In this way, the addition of a CLI took very little time (2 hours) because our architecture choice is highly maintainable.

### Concrete Test Cases

In part 2, we listed contracts that we would subscribe to through our unit tests. Below are the unit test implementations. Please note: Many of our preconditions are asserted by our user interface design. For example, it may be a precondition that we cannot be in a game mode type other than "Connect 4" or "Toot and Otto." Our UIs only allow these choices, so there is no need to validate the precondition.

```
def test update turn
assert equal(AppModel::PLAYER 1 TURN, @model.state[:turn])
@model.update turn(AppModel::PLAYER 2 TURN)
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_2_TURN, @model.state[:turn])
end
def test_update_type
assert equal(AppModel::CONNECT 4, @model.state[:type])
@model.update game type(AppModel::TOOT AND OTTO)
assert_equal(AppModel::TOOT_AND_OTTO, @model.state[:type])
end
def test_update_mode
assert equal(AppModel::PLAYER PLAYER, @model.state[:mode])
@model.update_game_mode(AppModel::PLAYER_CPU)
assert equal(AppModel::PLAYER CPU, @model.state[:mode])
@model.update game mode(AppModel::CPU PLAYER)
assert_equal(AppModel::CPU_PLAYER, @model.state[:mode])
end
def test update phase
assert_equal(AppModel::MENU, @model.state[:phase])
@model.update game phase(AppModel::IN PROGRESS)
assert_equal(AppModel::IN_PROGRESS, @model.state[:phase])
@model.update game phase(AppModel::GAME OVER)
assert_equal(AppModel::GAME_OVER, @model.state[:phase])
end
def test_column_full
6.times do
 @model.place_token(0)
end
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_1_TURN, @model.state[:turn])
@model.place token(0)
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_1_TURN, @model.state[:turn])
end
```

```
def test c4 vert
3.times do
 @model.place token(0)
 @model.place_token(1)
end
@model.board_place_token(0)
assert_true(@model.connect_4_vertical?)
end
def test c4 horiz
3.times do |i|
 @model.place token(i)
 @model.place_token(i)
end
@model.board_place_token(3)
assert_true(@model.connect_4_horizontal?)
end
def test c4 right diag
@model.place token(0) #1
@model.place token(1) #2
@model.place_token(1) #1
@model.place token(2) #2
@model.place_token(3) #1
@model.place token(2) #2
@model.place_token(2) #1
@model.place_token(3) #2
@model.place token(3) #1
@model.place_token(4) #2
@model.board_place_token(3)
assert_true(@model.connect_4_right_diagonal?)
end
def test c4 left diag
@model.place_token(0) #1
@model.place token(0) #2
@model.place token(0) #1
@model.place_token(1) #2
@model.place token(0) #1
@model.place_token(1) #2
@model.place_token(1) #1
@model.place_token(2) #2
@model.place_token(2) #1
@model.place_token(4) #2
@model.board place token(3) #1
assert_true(@model.connect_4_left_diagonal?)
end
```

```
def test ot horiz
@model.place token(0)
@model.place token(1)
@model.place token(3)
@model.board_place_token(2)
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_1_WINS, @model.toot_and_otto_horizontal)
end
def test_ot_vert
@model.place token(0)
@model.place token(0)
@model.place token(1)
@model.place_token(0)
@model.board place token(0)
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_1_WINS, @model.toot_and_otto_vertical)
end
def test_ot_right_diag
@model.place token(0) #1
@model.place token(2) #2
@model.place token(1) #1
@model.place_token(1) #2
@model.place token(2) #1
@model.place_token(2) #2
@model.place token(3) #1
@model.place_token(3) #2
@model.place_token(3) #1
@model.place token(4) #2
@model.board place token(3)
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_1_WINS, @model.toot_and_otto_right_diagonal)
end
def test_ot_left_diag
@model.place token(0) #1
@model.place_token(0) #2
@model.place token(0) #1
@model.place token(1) #2
@model.place_token(0) #1
@model.place token(1) #2
@model.place_token(2) #1
@model.place_token(1) #2
@model.place_token(3) #1
@model.board place token(2)
assert_equal(AppModel::PLAYER_1_WINS, @model.toot_and_otto_left_diagonal)
end
```