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**INTRODUCTION**

**Purpose**

**Scope**

**SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE**

**Chosen Architecture**

The architecture we have chosen for this project is the “Model-View-Controller” architecture. This architecture works well with the concept of a game, and allows us to separate the interface from the game model. “Model-View-Controller” keeps the user interface separate from the game logic, which makes it easy to design, update, and maintain the interface to the game. By keeping the game logic in one place, any changes to the game logic itself are also easier to manage as they will not affect the controller or view. This architecture will also allow for easier testing, as each layer can be tested separately and can be guaranteed to work with any other layer through predefined interfaces. Overall the “Model-View-Controller” matches the system requirements more effectively than other architectures we have studied.

**Other Considerations**

One of the architectures we studied was the “Data-Driven” architecture. This does not seem to be a necessary architecture for our system as there is no underlying data storage or lookup. All data used in the system is created and used during play and is not stored after the application has been terminated. The robot data from the librarian will travel through the system in JSON format, however it is unnecessary to store this information after a match has finished as it will be sent back to the librarian, which will manage it according to its specifications. Thus a data-driven architecture seems to have more overhead than is necessary for the system, and would ultimately be more costly than beneficial.

We also studied the “Call-and-Return” architecture. Some aspects of this architecture could be beneficial to the system, such as the ability to easily distribute across multiple machines or networks. Though this may make the networking pieces of the system easier, “Call-and-Return” has negative affects to keeping the game system simple and easy to manage. The hierarchical nature of this architecture would not allow us to abstract the input and output interfaces from the model of the game, and many objects would rely on each other, creating high coupling. This will ultimately impede our ability to manage game components separately from the user interface, making testing and implementation more work than is necessary. The “Call-and-Return” architecture does not fit well with the requirements for the system.

The “Pipes and Filters” architecture was the final architecture we considered. We found that this architecture would be useful for translating information from one state to another. It is not particularly useful for the overall game system, but may prove useful for specific pieces in the architecture. As an example, the robot librarian collects robot programs and gives them to the system. This data needs to be parsed out into a format that can be read by the system. Using “Pipes and Filters” would be useful in designing this piece of the system, but will not be effective for the overall game, where there is really no pipeline of commands being executed.
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