			STUDENT		Polli Federico	
					total mark:	
					20	
EXERCISE	Component	Description	max value	max sub-values		
	care about threads' affinity	You discovered that only close to the deadline, so th	2			
	catch about timings	understanding about different components of the run-time	2			
	overall accuracy and originality	takes into account also plot quality	2			
	explicit validation and verification		1			
	additional points	a power bank for additional points	2			
	sloppiness	...if you have been particularly not accurate	-4			*I was tempted to put at least -1 here, but I did not want to bring you below 20. Let's see the assignment 3*
EXERCISE 0			12		4.7	
Part 1			2		1.7	
	overall correctness	*All in all, the goal has been correctly achieved; measures result from run repetition and correct averaging*		1.5	1.2	*this section is quite sloppy*
		elimination of pointless stats (i.e. avg, min and max thread time)			☐	
		thread placement has been taken into account (close vs spread)			☐	
		the proponent clearly catches about the init time in the comparison			☐	
		runs repetition to extract meaningful averaged timings			☐	
		sigma^2 is reported			☐	
	data presentation is correct	*The scaling is properly presented (for instance, normalized instead of given by absolute timings)*		0.5	0.5	
Part 2			5		1	
	overall correctness	*The parallel overhead has been measured in a convincing way and the proponent has understood the meaning of what he/she has measured*		3	1	*you do not even mention how you do define the overhead*
	data presentation is correct	*The measures are correctly related to their meaning; plots are immediate to read (for instance: normalized values, not absolute)*		2	0	
e						
Part 3			5		1	
	overall correctness	*(1) the metrics provided are correct, related to the scope and their usage is actually explaining the behaviour of the codes; OR, (2) the metrics provided are correct, but it appears that they are not able to explain the codes' behaviour and the proponent clearly discuss it*		3	1	*which metrics do you provide??*
	data presentation is correct	*data are properly normalized; units of measure are clearly understandable*		2	0	
Optional part			3		1	*you just mention something about it, which sounds more or less in a good direction. But you do not show anything*
EXERCISE	Component	Description	max value	max sub-values		
EXERCISE 1			18		0	
Part 0 (code implementation)			8		0	
	code correctness and quality	*All in all, the goal has been correctly achieved; omp code is correct*		8		
		correctness			☐	
		quality			☐	
Part 1			2		0	
	overall correctness	*The scaling is properly presented (for instance, normalized instead of given by absolute timings)*				
		runs repetition to extract meaningful averaged timings			☐	
		sigma^2 is reported			☐	
Part 2			5		0	
	overall correctness	*The parallel overhead has been measured in a convincing way and the proponent has understood the meaning of what he/she has measured*		5		
Part 3			3		0	
	overall correctness	*The measures are correctly related to their meaning; plots are immediate to read (for instance: normalized values, not absolute); placement policy is taken into account*		3		
EXERCISE	Component	Description	max value	max sub-values		
EXERCISE 2			18		15	
	overall correctness	*All in all, the goal has been correctly achieved; omp code is correct, measures result from run repetition and correct averaging*		18	15	*the code is substantially correct,the quality of your report is badly low. I do not want to penalize you too much, so almost full score here*
		omp code is correct			☑	
		runs repetition to extract meaningful averaged timings			☐	
		sigma^2 is reported			☐	
EXERCISE	Component	Description	max value	max sub-values		
EXERCISE 3			22		0	
Part 0 (code implementation)			16		0	
	code correctness and quality	*All in all, the goal has been correctly achieved; omp code is correct*				
		correctness			☐	
		quality			☐	
Part 1			6		0	
	overall correctness	*All in all, the goal has been correctly achieved; measures result from run repetition and correct averaging; par. overhead has been measured convincingly and the proponent has understood the meaning of what he/she has measured*				
		runs repetition to extract meaningful averaged timings			☐	
		sigma^2 is reported			☐	