

In-class 3

There are two images we will be working with:

- word_matrix.png
- mask.png

The word_matrix is a .png image that contains a spreadsheet of words with a hidden message in it. Your task is to use the mask.png image to reveal the **hidden message** inside the word_matrix.png.

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| STOP | FAIR | SCORE | FIELD | WOLF | SNATCH | PIER | DAWN |
| WOOD | GREAT | MAID | STRONG | FRONT | TEAM | CLOSED | PITCH |
| HOLD | CURL | BRAVE | SPITE | DESK | FADE | NAME | LIST |
| FALL | HILL | TREE | WORK | SPHERE | CHORD | COAST | BOLD |
| YARD | LAND | CHURCH | LATE | TRAY | PLUCK | DARE | GRIND |
| FIGHT | MY | PAUSE | DOG | TIGHT | FUR | STREAM | SIN |
| CALF | HIKE | DASH | FLOOD | TENSE | WITH | PUMP | BAT |
| FLU | WENT | SOW | QUOTE | DRAWER | HOUSE | TOUCH | SUN |
| LOUNGE | THE | CLOSE | DUE | HIKE | SAVE | FOX | WAGE |
| BRINK | STORE | HEAT | POP | EAST | SOW | MAP | OH |
| DRINK | TODAY | SHOT | SOLVE | NOTE | WAVE | IMAGES | TRACE |
| TURN | FOR | JAM | DECK | SOAK | STAB | SPIN | WEALTH |
| YOU | NOW | NEWS | CHEAT | LAST | FRAME | TRUCK | SPLURGE |
| GLARE | TRAVEL | ARE | ROOT | SCREAM | GHOST | BENCH | TONGUE |
| STYLE | LOOT | LODGE | MILE | PRAYER | MONTH | TROOP | STOP |
| SWING | MASS | FRESH | DORM | THE | BRIDE | BEST | SUM |
| SMASH | REST | PLAN | SITE | MOLE | DRY | DOSE | SCALE |
| CHOP | MY | GIFT | CORE | JUDGE | BLONDE | BEACH | STORE |
| HALT | WORK | NUT | SHIFT | TAIL | EAST | SLANT | REACH |



Suggestions:

- You may need to make changes to the mask.png for this to work because the mask is currently not the desired size.
- You may need to change the transparency of the mask when it lays over the word matrix. Transparency and masking documentation can be found here: <https://pillow.readthedocs.io/en/stable/>

Requirements:

As output, you will need to provide/show the following:

1. An image showing mask properly overlay the word matrix to reveal the hidden message.
2. Write out the **hidden message** in a markdown box.

Submit your file as a finished Jupyter Notebook.

The grading rubrics is as follows:

| Criteria | Full Marks (100%) | High Partial Marks (75%) | Middle Partial Marks (50%) | Low Partial Marks (25%) | No Marks (0%) |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Functionality and Correctness (50 points) | The code successfully generates expected outputs. | The code mostly works but misses a few outputs or occasionally encounters errors that do not significantly impact the overall functionality. | The code partially works, but fails to generate all expected outputs or frequently encounters errors. | The code has limited functionality, with significant issues. | The code does not function correctly; it fails to the expected outputs. |
| Code Efficiency and Quality (20 points) | The code is highly efficient, with no redundancy, and follows best practices in Python programming. | The code is mostly efficient but contains some unnecessary parts or could be optimized for better performance. | The code works but is inefficient or does not follow best practices, making it less effective or slower than necessary. | The code has significant inefficiencies or poor practices that heavily impact its performance and effectiveness. | The code is inefficient, poorly written, and does not adhere to basic programming practices. |
| Error Handling and Data Validation (20 points) | The code includes robust error handling and data validation to gracefully manage exceptions and ensure only images are saved. | The code includes some error handling and data validation, but there are minor gaps that could be improved. | The code has minimal error handling or data validation, leading to potential issues with exception management or incorrect file saving. | The code lacks sufficient error handling and data validation, resulting in frequent errors or inappropriate file saving. | The code does not include error handling or data validation, making it prone to failure and incorrect data handling. |
| Documentation and Code Readability (10 points) | The code is excellently documented with clear, concise comments explaining each major step. Variable names are meaningful, enhancing readability. | The code is well-documented with good comments and variable names, but there are sections that could be clearer or more descriptive. | The code has some documentation and readability efforts, but comments are sparse, or variable names are not consistently meaningful. | The code has minimal documentation or effort toward readability, making it difficult to understand the logic and flow. | The code lacks documentation and readability, with no comments and poor variable naming, making it challenging to follow. |