CMSI 371-01
COMPUTER GRAPHICS
Spring 2013

Assignment 0226 Feedback

Because *2c* involves color and light computations, and this assignment pertains only to color, *2c* tops out at **|** with future assignments allowing expansion of this to **+**.

Andrew Kowalczyk

1a — Your proficiency with handling digital visual information in terms of pixels and geometric primitives is definitely well-demonstrated here. (**+**)

2c — Your color computations are decent, but they only cover the single-pixel variety. You never did a genuine neighborhood-based calculation—you need to show your stuff with that too. (**/**)

3b — You have shown a fine capacity for implementing graphics primitives. There is a slight miss in your circle gradient code though—you are using the wrong value for `r`, which I presume you intend as the radius of the circle. See the inline comments. The rest of the gradient computation is correct though, so I won't ding you for that one. (**+**)

3c — You did great with low-level color manipulation for single-pixel filters, but did not end up writing any real *neighborhood* filters—even your supposed neighborhood filters only used a single pixel. (**|**)

4a — Your code is certainly functional and works as intended. The only real bug that I spotted is the aforementioned miscalculated radius in your gradient circle. Plus, I think that logic can be simplified a bit, but I consider that a follow-up phase. The rest of your code looks fine. (**+**)

4b — Your choices regarding separation of concerns are largely well-made. The one hiccup is your non-inclusion of your single-pixel filters as part of the `Nanoshop` object. This was actually requested in the assignment instructions, and was done with `NanoshopNeighborhood` as an example. (**|**)

4c — Your code is generally readable and formatted well. Your comments are more detailed than average, and are helpful especially in the more complex portions (although I think one of the comment blocks in the gradient circle code is incomplete—see the inline feedback). (**+**)

4d — Your work shows good use of resources and documentation, but is necessarily knocked down a little bit because you never ended up doing a genuine neighborhood filter. (**|**)

4e — Your commit pace looks pretty good, but your commit messages can be more descriptive. For example, many of your comments take the form "Edited the _____ file(s)." That can use more detail—*what* did you edit? One of your commits (3272f1d3b85790406671fd9c64c02d702b8979e9, to be exact) had the message "Fixed the code to work"—OK, but *what* bug did you fix? What wasn't working before? How well is it working now? Specificity helps log your progress better. (**/**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)

Minor update based on May 6 commit:

3c — Your `minimum` function is noted, and it does genuinely use the neighborhood, but the assignment asked for two such functions and this is only one. (**|**)