

Ashish Pokharel
Bibek Panday Kshetri
Eric Duong

CSE 134 HW3 Project Report

We employed vanilla css and Bootstrap framework to prototype our MovieDex application. Following the class lecture, we used light weight images by using online compression tools for our movie thumbnails for both technologies implemented, so that there would be similarity in the content between the two.

Comparing the approaches:

Writing the css was rather difficult compared to using the framework. We had add several rules here and there to get the result desired. Sometimes it was frustrating because we were not able to figure out, even though we had initially assumed it to work, why the content was shifted far to the left, or scrolled passed over navigation bar on the top etc. Even though it came with above mentioned difficulties, we felt that we had a freedom to choose our designs as per our desire and we could simply write our own unique class and ids to use in the markup. The sheer sweetness was seen when we were able to compare the loading of these two implementations, and actually able to what happens under the hood.

Bootstrapping was rather easy as we did not have to spend a lot of time writing down the css. We went to the Bootstrap website and linked the style, and wollah! We were ready to go. Now, after linking the style, it was the matter of finding out our desired classes and embedding them in the markup, and honestly this was the only time consuming part. Even though, bootstrapping gave us the ease and beauty, we did not feel as much freedom using the predefined rules as we did during writing our own css.

Unix command `wc -l <filename.txt>` was used to calculate the lines of code in html and css files

	Vanilla CSS	Bootstrap Framework
Work Effort (1-10)	10	6
Lines of code (approx) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HTML• CSS	990 1250	503 N/A (Used online FW)
Hours taken (combined approx)	34 hours	10 hours
Load time	6.43 secs	6.59 sces
Bytes count	359 KB	450

**** Tested in regular 3G 100ms, 750kbps, 250kbps.**

Now, there is no clear winner, as we can see both approaches have their own goods and bads. Over our group discussion we discussed when we might use one or the other technologies or both.

Vanilla CSS:

We would use this approach when we need to hand-craft a design. We can literally tailor things to our need and be able to deliver a much faster product if we aim for it.

- To deliver minimum and semantic markup
- To make maximum use of the scripts and plugins, as they will be applied only when needed.
- Easy to customize the designs as per the requirements
- device friendly, improved performances, and freedom.

Bootstrap:

We would use this approach when building something big, that might require a lot of features and writing down css rules may be time consuming. Also, from the above table we can clearly see why bootstrapping is effective when things are to be delivered in less amount of time.

- Offers a standard platform, such as the famous layout grid, with almost all the basics already defined and ready to be used
- We may need to worry less about browser support and compatibilities as it comes standard with all the major browser-supports..
- Although comes with a heavy file, we can still customize them and use less if we desire to do so.
- CSS comes with mobile friendly and other device friendly standards.
- Javascript plugins are already included using jQuery, so it saves time in writing down scripts as well