

Homework Assignment No. 05:

HW No. 05: Dynamic Programming

submitted to

Professor Joseph Picone
ECE 8527: Introduction to Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning
Temple University
College of Engineering
1947 North 12th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

March 23, 2024

prepared by:

Leo Berman/Shane McNicholas
Email: leo.berman@temple.edu/shane.mcnicholas@temple.edu

A. TESTING APPROACH

In order to test our approach, we decided to test it against all of the test cases provided to us. We copied all of the tests over and used a combination of python and command line tools in order to parse each test into a file that the program understands. We then iterated through each test for the program and compared the outputs of our program versus the output of the current system.

B. EXAMPLE RESULTS

Our code got every test correct. However, it got different solutions on a few tests:

Control Results:

THE transaction requires approval of a majority of * ***** THE SHARES of the HOLDERS NOT AFFILIATED WITH MR. ICAHN

A transaction requires approval of a majority of A SHARE A LOT of the ***** *** ***** ***** LATIN AMERICA

Substitutions: 5 Insertions: 4 Deletions: 2 Total: 11

Our Results:

A transaction requires approval of a majority of *** ***** A SHARE A LOT OF THE LATIN AMERICA THE transaction requires approval of a majority of THE SHARES OF THE HOLDERS NOT AFFILIATED WITH MR. ICAHN

Substitutions: 9 Insertions: 2 Deletions: 0 Total: 11

Control Results:

REF: the company THEN ACCEPTS THE shares tendered AT the lowest ***** PRICE NEEDED to REACH ITS GOAL THEN PAYS that amount FOR all shares IT PURCHASES

HYP: the company RAN INTO ITS shares tendered AND the lowest PRICED BELOW THREE to ***** *** ***** ELIMINATE that amount OF all shares THE AREA

Substitutions: 10 Insertions: 4 Deletions: 1 Total: 15

Our Results:

the company THEN ACCEPTS THE shares tendered AT the lowest PRICE NEEDED TO REACH ITS GOAL THEN PAYS that amount FOR all shares IT PURCHASES

the company RAN INTO ITS shares tendered AND the lowest ***** ***** ** PRICED BELOW THREE TO ELIMINATE that amount OF all shares THE AREA

Substitutions: 12 Insertions: 3 Deletions: 0 Total: 15

Control Results:

*** WE'RE not PREPARED to BE ADVOCATES FOR the *** K. G. B.

WHO ARE not ***** to ** HEAD OF the END THE CANDIDATE WHO

Substitutions: 6 Insertions: 2 Deletions: 2 Total: 10

Our Results:

R: WE'RE NOT PREPARED to BE ADVOCATES FOR THE K. G. B.

H: WHO ARE NOT to HEAD OF THE END THE CANDIDATE WHO

Substitutions: 10 Insertions: 0 Deletions: 0 Total: 10

C. SUMMARY

Overall, we can see that our program has a bias towards substitutions whereas the control algorithm has a more even distribution. There were 25 test cases that followed this pattern. This seems to be a difference in the algorithms or perhaps in classifying some of the changes as 2 substitutions instead of an insertion and a deletion.