

## Final Project

RELEASE DATE: 04/30/2020

DUE DATE: 06/24/2020 (**Wednesday!!**), **23:59** on Gradescope

*Unless granted by the instructor in advance, no late submissions will be allowed. Also, the gold medals cannot be used on the final project.*

## Introduction

The main theme of the final project is a email searcher. The email searcher helps retrieving precious emails from the mail pool, which contains mails that came in a streaming manner. Of course, we expect the searcher to effectively use the computational and storage resources of your computer. So the data structure (and the associated algorithm) used for representing the mail pool can be crucial.

## Problem Description

The email searcher needs the following basic functionality. You can use your own function prototype for implementing the functionality.

- **add**: adds a mail into database.
- **remove**: removes a mail from database.
- **longest**: return the longest mail.
- **query**: return mails that fits the search query.

## Survey Report

You are asked to study at least **THREE data structures** for dealing with the email searcher. Then, you should make a comparison of those data structures according to some different perspectives, such as **average speed, worst speed, space, implementation, popularity**, etc.. Based on the results of your comparison, you are asked to **recommend the best one** for the email searcher, and provide the “cons and pros” of the choice.

The survey report should be less than or equal to **six** A4-pages with readable font sizes and formats. Criteria for evaluating your survey report would include, but are not limited to, clarity, strength of your reasoning, “correctness” in using the data structures, and the work loads of team members.

## Competition

We will hold a mini-competition for the project. Each team is asked to submit the source code of your email searcher to be automatically compiled on some Linux machine for the mini-competition. The details will be announced soon. Basically, two things will be tested in the competition:

- the accuracy of the searcher
- if the accuracy is 100%, the speed of your email searcher

The competition ends with the final project. The winning teams will be announced online and receive some secret gifts from the instructor.

Every team is asked to submit to the mini-competition at least three times (with the three data structures used) and list the results in the survey report. Of course, more submissions are encouraged and welcomed.

## Submission File

Please submit your report to Gradescope. You **do not need to submit your source/program(s)** for grading, but please keep all the source files until 7/31/2020 for possible verification. The report should contain the following items:

- (1) the team members' names and school IDs
- (2) how you divide the responsibilities of the team members
- (3) the data structures you compared, including **the results submitted** to the mini-competition site
- (4) the data structure you recommend
- (5) the advantages of the recommendation
- (6) the disadvantages of the recommendation
- (7) how to compile your code and use the email searcher
- (8) the **bonus features** you implement and why you think they deserve the bonus

## Misc Rules

**Report:** No, you do not need to submit a hard-copy.

**Teams:** By default, you are asked to work as a team of size three. A one-person or two-people team is allowed only if you are willing to be as good as a three-people team. It is expected that all team members share balanced work loads. Any form of unfairness in a three-people team, such as the intention to cover the other member's work, is considered a violation of the honesty policy and will cause both members to receive zero or negative score.

**Data Structures and Algorithms:** You can use any data structures and algorithms, regardless of whether they were taught in class.

**Packages:** You can couple your email searcher with any software package (as long as you are not violating any copyright) but you need to *clearly cite where you get the code and clearly describing what the source code does* in your report.

**I/O restrictions:** Your program should only open the input files provided by the TAs. In general, your program cannot open any other files nor access any other things through the Internet.

**Platform and Language:** As usual, you can only use C/C++ to design your main program. If you use packages from other languages, you still need to call them from C/C++. You can either use Linux or Windows as the running platform of your email searcher. But note that the submission to the mini-competition (which is required) needs to be Linux-compatible with a Makefile (details to be announced).

**Grade:** The grading TAs would grade qualitatively with letters: A++[210], A+[196], A[186], B+[176], B[166], C+[156], C[146], D+[136], D[126], F+[116], F[76], F-[36], Z[0]. The score of the team would be the average of all the grading TAs. We reserve the possibility to adjust individual scores in the team based on performance/workload if necessary. The final project is equivalent to four usual homework sets. Your raw score in the class would be calculated by

$$\frac{\text{best homework} * 1.5 + \text{worst homework} * 0.5 + \text{other homework} + \text{final} * 4}{10}.$$

If your email searcher meets the basic functionality and you write down every item reasonably in the survey report, you will get **at least B**.

**Bonus:** We encourage everyone to think about making your email searcher better. The room between B[162] and A++[210] is basically left for **bonus**. To get bonus points, you need to justify that the additional features/functionality of the email searcher is worth being the bonus in your report. For instance, you can try to compare more data structures/algorithms or add your creativity in designing some good

data structures/algorithms for the email searcher. Some more functionality (such as being Gmail-search compatible?) is also worth thinking.

**Collaboration:** The general collaboration policy applies. In addition to the competitions, we still encourage collaborations and discussions between different teams.