Object Oriented Programming – 2017/2018 – 2nd Semester Self-evaluation form

Group:	14	Oral dis	scussion date:		Penalization (day	s):
Number:	77028	Name:	Tiago Santos		Expected mark:	15
Number:	81570	Name:	1 / 6		Expected mark: _	15
Number: _		_	D 1 C		Expected mark: _	
Number: _		Name: _			Expected mark: _	
General aspections How do you closes your app	cts: lassify the	UML too	ol used (identify it)?ernal library, besides that	provided within JD	K?	Bad
x No ☐ Yes ((which one	es?):	pplication have? 1			
•			pplication have? 1		□ ≥ 3:	
• • •			urther developments? 🗵 Yest one polymorphic invoca		☐ Partialy	
Does your app			1 0 1	uon:		
			operator is used in your a	pplication (really co	ount them)?	
In which meth	ods?			11		
Which XML p	arser is us	ed to parse	e the input file? DOM			
Have external	libraries b	een requi	red? No X Yes (which	ones?): javax.xml.	oarsers.*, org.w3c.do	om.*, org.xm
Do you provid	le a DTD?	x Yes	☐ No When parsing, i	s XML validated ag	gainst it? X Yes	□No
•	sibility of		, check visibilities that are	used in the code:		
x Public		x Privat		C	☐ Protected	
-	sibility of		ods, check visibilities that			
x Public	. 11. 1114	▼ Privat		•	Protected	.1
			es, check visibilities that any static field? X Yes (how			каде
			static method? X Yes (h			
			user defined exceptions?			No
					·/·	
Simulation pr						
			: PriorityQueue		njava.util? □No	o X Yes
Is it ordered?			, with a: Comparable	x Comparator		
Are all events Death:	mpiemen x Yes	ted as des	scribed in the project described in the projec	•		
Reproduction:			☐ With faults		nplemented nplemented	
Move:	Y Yes		☐ With faults		nplemented	
	_	nented as	events? Yes No	All 20 at once in t		X No
Data structure					n java.util? No	
Is it ordered?		-	, with a: Comparable	Comparator	-	_
Data structure	for the gri	d: <i>N</i>	Matrix of node objects	From	java.util? 🗓 No	Yes
Are epidemics	impleme	ited as de	scribed in the project desc	ription? X Yes	☐ With faults	□No
			n memory? \mathbf{x} Yes \mathbf{n} No,	•	•	
			ve epidemics, is a random	•	•	□No
			emory? Yes No (w	<u> </u>		
is the best path	n always f	ound whe	n you run the xml five pro	vided in the Project	webpage? Yes	□No

Global evaluation:							
What was the degree of participation of each element in the							
Num_77028 : 33 % Num_81570 : 33 % Num_8	<u>: 3</u>	3_% Num		_:%			
In the extent of your perception of the developed work, fill the	e following tab	oles:					
Project documentation			Ŋ	les No			
Is the project correctly documented through comments in the	e source code?		[2	X			
Was the javadoc tool used to build the documentation of the	developed pac	kages?					
Is it complete, with:							
- overview of packages?			2	X			
- summary of classes, interfaces and exceptions?				X			
- brief description of classes, interfaces and exceptions?	X						
- summary of fields, constructors and methods?							
- detail of fields, constructors and methods?			Σ	ζ			
Project compilation			•	Zoc. No.			
Project compilation				les No			
Does the project compile without errors?							
Does the project compile without warnings?	9		[3				
If the answer is no, are all these warnings unchecked warning	gs:						
Running		Yes	No W	Vith faults			
Is the jar file runnable from the shell?		X					
Does the project read correctly the parameters?		X					
Does the project run with the input given in the project webp	page?	X					
Does the project generate any supplementary information (st		tc)?	X				
				☐ Mac/O			
Development environment used? Linux Windows Unix							
Java version used:10							
Was the final program tested in the laboratory workstations?	x Yes		□No				
The following table is to be filled by the professor :							
Report	Yes/Good	No/Bad	Incomple	ete/Fair			
Cover identifies the course, authors and group number							
Goals of the work are very succinct but clearly stated	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Intelligibility of the document							
Structure of the document							
Clear/concise justification of main data structures used							
OO solution (extensibility, polymorphism, etc.)							
Critical evaluation of the application performance							
Description of functionalities beyond requested ones							
Conclusions							
,							