Evaluation of Assignment Set I
<u>CS 431: Programming Languages Lab</u>

Group Name	Student Name & Roll No	Comments of the Evaluator(s)	Marks
Group-1	N Rajendhar Reddy 150101040	**Problem 1:** Interface may improve (-3) No standard coding style and comments are followed in coding (-3) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 2:** Interface may improve (-3), Explanation is not satisfactory (-3) No standard coding style and comments are followed in coding (-4) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 3:** No standard data handling (-5) GUI could be made in a better way (-3) No standard coding style and comments are followed in coding (-6) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3)	61
	S Bharath Chandra 150101066	**Problem 1:** Interface may improve (-3) No standard coding style and comments are followed in coding (-3) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 2:** Interface may improve (-3), Explanation is not satisfactory (-3) No standard coding style and comments are followed in coding (-4) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 3:** No standard data handling (-5) GUI could be made in a better way (-3) No standard coding style and comments are followed in coding (-6) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3)	61
	Abhishek Goyal	**Problem 1:**	

Group-2	150101002	Interface may improve in error cases (-2) Code is well documented. celerity of concurrency and synchronization are missing in your report (-2) **Problem 2:** Some concepts are not clear (-5) Code is well documented. celerity of concurrency and synchronization are missing in your report (-2) **Problem 3:** No standard data handling is used previous history is missed (-5) GUI could be made in a better way for receiving order and report (-3) celerity of concurrency and synchronization are missing in your report (-2)	79
	Roopansh Bansal 150101053	**Problem 1:** Interface may improve in error cases (-2) Code is well documented. celerity of concurrency and synchronization are missing in your report (-2) **Problem 2:** Some concepts are not clear (-5) Code is well documented. celerity of concurrency and synchronization are missing in your report (-2) **Problem 3:** No standard data handling is used previous history is missed (-5) GUI could be made in a better way for receiving order and report (-3) celerity of concurrency and synchronization are missing in your report (-2)	79
Group-3	Anirudh sharma 150101006	**Problem 1:** Interface may improve for not able to modify data (-2) Some concepts are not clear (-3) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-3) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 2:** Some Concepts is not clear of synchronization (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3)	65

		Problem 3: No standard data handling is used; previous history is missed. (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3)	
	Saket Agrawal 150101054	**Problem 1:** Interface may improve for not able to modify data (-2) Some concepts are not clear (-3) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-3) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 2:** Some Concepts is not clear of synchronization (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3) **Problem 3:** No standard data handling is used; previous history is missed. (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Poor writing style, celerity of why concurrency and synchronization are missing in report (-3)	65
Group-4	SATYA PRAKASH 150101060	**Problem 1:** Some extend concepts are not clear (-3) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **Problem 2:** Some Concepts is not clear of synchronization (-3) More attentiveness required in GUI (-2) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **Problem 3:** No standard data handling is used (-5) Need more attentiveness in GUI (-2) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good	85
	ABHAY KUMAR	**Problem 1:**	

	150101001	Some extend concepts are not clear (-3) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **Problem 2:** Some Concepts is not clear of synchronization (-3) More attentiveness required in GUI (-2) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **Problem 3:** No standard data handling is used (-5) Need more attentiveness in GUI (-2) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **[overall contribution is less (-10)]**	75
	Gaurav Nakum 150101084	**Problem 1:** Some extend concepts are not clear (-3) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **Problem 2:** Some Concepts is not clear of synchronization (-3) More attentiveness required in GUI (-2) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good **Problem 3:** No standard data handling is used (-5) Need more attentiveness in GUI (-2) Standard coding style and comments are followed in coding. Report is good	85
Group-5	Neel Mittal 150101042	**Problem 1:** Some concepts are not clear (-3) standard coding style and comments are followed in few places in coding (-2) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 2:** Interface need to be improved to show the problem of modification clearly (-5) standard coding style and comments are used in few places in coding (-2) Standard report writing style is not followed	73

		and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 3:** GUI could be made in a better way (-5) standard coding style and comments are used in few places in coding (-4) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2)	
	Prashansi Kamdar 150101047	**Problem 1:** Some concepts are not clear (-3) standard coding style and comments are followed in few places in coding (-2) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 2:** Interface need to be improved to show the problem of modification clearly (-5) standard coding style and comments are used in few places in coding (-2) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 3:** GUI could be made in a better way (-5) standard coding style and comments are used in few places in coding (-4) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2)	73
Group-6	Deshmukh Udayraj 150101021	**Problem 1:** Some Concepts are not clear (-3) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-3) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 2:** Concept package method not able to explain somewhat what they have implemented (-5) Slandered coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 3:** GUI could be made in a better way (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-6) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2)	78
	Anurag Ramteke 150101010	**Problem 1:** Some Concepts are not clear (-3)	

		standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-3) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 2:** Concept package method not able to explain somewhat what they have implemented (-5) Slandered coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2) **Problem 3:** GUI could be made in a better way (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-6) Standard report writing style is not followed and explain problem not what asked (-2)	78
Group-7	Gourika Bang 150101025	**Problem 1:** Concept and representation was good. standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-3) Concrete explanation of concurrency and synchronization is missing in report (-3) **Problem 2:** Standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4) Concrete explanation of concurrency and synchronization is missing in report (-3) **Problem 3:** Good GUI (owner side/server side) + runtime validations + reports generated and presentation was good. Some Concepts is not clear (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-6) Concrete explanation of concurrency and synchronization is missing in report (-3)	73
	Saurabh 150101062	**Problem 1:** Concept and representation was good. standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-3) Concrete explanation of concurrency and synchronization is missing in report (-3) **Problem 2:** Standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-4)	73

		Concrete explanation of concurrency and synchronization is missing in report (-3) **Problem 3:** Good GUI (owner side/server side) + runtime validations + reports generated and presentation was good. Some Concepts is not clear (-5) standard coding style and comments are not followed in coding (-6) Concrete explanation of concurrency and synchronization is missing in report (-3)	
Group-8	Joy Chopra 150101083	**Problem 1:** Some package concepts are not clear (-3) Comments are given in method level (-2) Report is good **Problem 2:** Some package concepts are not clear related with synchronization (-3) Comments are given in method level (-2) Report is good **Problem 3:** Presentation was good, but seems some lack of concept while explaining (-7) Some comments are missing (-3) At least file is used as data storage at the backend Report is good	80
	Satya Prakash 150101087	**Problem 1:** Some package concepts are not clear (-3) Comments are given in method level (-2) Report is good **Problem 2:** Some package concepts are not clear related with synchronization (-3) Comments are given in method level (-2) Report is good **Problem 3:** Presentation was good, but seems some lack of concept while explaining (-7) Some comments are missing (-3) At least file is used as data storage at the backend Report is good	80
Group-9	K Y Mouli 150101029	Code documentation not done properly(-5) GUI not implemented(-10) Purchase list not implemented(-5) Lacks proper understanding about some basic	75

		topics (like shared resources) which is also reflected in report(-5)	
	S N V S R K Prudhvi 150101055	Code documentation not done properly(-5) GUI not implemented(-10) Purchase list not implemented(-5) Lacks proper understanding about some basic topics (like shared resources) which is also reflected in report(-5)	75
Group-10	Chinmoy Jyoti Kathar 150101019	Code documentation not done properly(-5) In problem 1, considered constraints which reduced the complexity of the problem (-10)	85
	Chinmoy Kachari 150101020	Code documentation not done properly(-5) In problem 1, considered constraints which reduced the complexity of the problem (-10) Seemed to have relatively lesser contribution(-10)	75
Group-11	SARTHAK TRIPATHI 150101057	Improper implementation of problem 1(-10) In problem 3 purchase list, sales list not implemented (-10) Report lacks clarity and is not to the point(-10)	70
	SAURABH SABHARWAL 150101061	Improper implementation of problem 1(-10) In problem 3 purchase list, sales list not implemented (-10) Report lacks clarity and is not to the point(-10)	70
Group-12	shailendra bramhe 150101065	Improper implementation of problem 1(-10) Problem 2 not done(-30) In problem 3, wrong way of implementing client-server architecture(-10) No sales list and purchase list implemented(-10) Answers in the report not proper(-5)	35
	ankit prajapati 150101007	Improper implementation of problem 1(-10) Problem 2 not done(-30) In problem 3, wrong way of implementing client-server architecture(-10) No sales list and purchase list implemented(-10) Answers in the report not proper(-5) Seemed to have relatively lesser contribution(-10)	25
Group-13	IRALA NARASIMHA REDDY DILIP KUMAR 150101027	In Problem 3, Purchase list not implemented (-5) In report while answering, all scenarios are not considered (-5)	90
	REDDI HAREESH 150101051	In Problem 3, Purchase list not implemented (-5) In report while answering, all scenarios are	90

		not considered (-5)	
Group-14	ABOTHULA RAKESH 150101004	Code documentation not done properly(-5) Improper implementation of problem 1 (-10) GUI not implemented(-10) Sales list and purchase list not implemented (-10) In Report, some answers are not satisfactory (-5)	60
	BOPPANA AKHILESH 150101018	Code documentation not done properly(-5) Improper implementation of problem 1 (-10) GUI not implemented(-10) Sales list and purchase list not implemented (-10) In Report, some answers are not satisfactory (-5) Seemed to have relatively lesser contribution (-10)	50
Group-15	Pulak Kuli 150101050	Code documentation not done properly(-5) Improper implementation of problem 1 (-10) In problem 2, 'Teacher' field in the student info file static which is misleading(-5) Some answers in the report not satisfactory (-5)	75
	Nayanjyoti Kakati 150101041	Code documentation not done properly(-5) Improper implementation of problem 1 (-10) In problem 2, 'Teacher' field in the student info file static which is misleading(-5) Some answers in the report not satisfactory (-5)	75
Group-16	Ritveeka Vashistha 150101082	Poor documentation with superficial explanation(-5) Problem-2: No sorted output in problem2(-5) Problem-2: CC modification part not done(-5) Problem-3: Client server problem, threshold part was not implemented properly(-5)	80
	Rohan Aggarwal 150101052	Poor documentation with superficial explanation(-5) Problem-2: No sorted output in problem2(-5) Problem-2: CC modification part not done(-5) Problem-3: Client server problem, threshold part was not implemented properly(-5) Seems that no proper understanding of code and concept in there(-5)	75
Group-17	Mukul Verma 150101038	Extra assumptions taken was not mentioned in the report with some wrong clarification(-4) Not documented the code properly(-5) Static program with 10 robotic arms was taken	

		without considering all possible cases. Inefficient implementation(-5) GUI was not working properly for two clients(-10) Threshold part was not running properly(-3)	73
	Shubhanshu Verma 150101073	Extra assumptions taken was not mentioned in the report with some wrong clarification(-4) Not documented the code properly(-5) Static program with 10 robotic arms was taken without considering all possible cases. Inefficient implementation(-5) GUI was not working properly for two clients(-10) Threshold part was not running properly(-3)	73
Group-18	Saswata De 150101058	Improper report with wrong understanding of problems (-4) Code was not documented properly(-5) The code was not generalized, running fine only for some cases in problem-1(-3) Problem2 was not working perfectly in case of without synchronization(-5) GUI was not implemented and only some part of code was not working without complete implementation.(-20)	63
	Gourav 150101024	Improper report with wrong understanding of problems (-4) Code was not documented properly(-5) The code was not generalized, running fine only for some cases in problem-1(-3) Problem2 was not working perfectly in case of without synchronization(-5) GUI was not implemented and only some part of code was not working without complete implementation.(-20) Not enough knowledge of the code submitted(-8)	55
Group-19	Satti Sai Chandan Reddy 150101059	Static implementation of problem1 (-4) Non-synchronized method in problem-2 was not working(-5) GUI part was not implemented(-10) Threshold part was not done(-5) Program was not able to generate bill(-5) Not clear understanding of the code(-5)	66
	Srikar Paruchuru 150101044	Static implementation of problem1 (-4) Non-synchronized method in problem-2 was not working(-5) GUI part was not implemented(-10)	71

		Threshold part was not done(-5) Program was not able to generate bill(-5)	
Group-20	Kushal K S V S 150101031	Bad way or preparing report(-3) Code was not documented properly(-5) Non-synchronized part of problem-2 was not working(-5) GUI part was not working and multiple client part was not there(-12)	75
	Abhinav Reddy N 150101039	Bad way or preparing report(-3) Code was not documented properly(-5) Non-synchronized part of problem-2 was not working(-5) GUI part was not working and multiple client part was not there(-12)	75
Group-21	Abhishek Kumar 150101003	Some wrong statements in the report(-3) Problem-1:Some arms were reading again and again(-5) Problem-2: Unable to show data inconsistent case(-5) Problem-3: Purchase list and sales list part was not implemented(-7)	80
	Vaibhav Pratap Singh 150101081	Some wrong statements in the report(-3) Problem-1:Some arms were reading again and again(-5) Problem-2: Unable to show data inconsistent case(-5) Problem-3: purchase list and sales list part was not implemented(-7)	80
Group-22	Shivram N Gowtham 150101069	Some wrong statements in report(-2) Problem - 1: Buffer in matching machine is assumed, this contradicts the problem statements. (-5) Problem - 2: Output could be improved (e.g., message could be shown when updation is not possible) (-3) Problem - 3:Address of delivery is not there (-5) unavailability of a particular item is not shown explicitly at the time of order (-5)	80
	Suhas Kantekar 150101077	Some wrong statements in report(-2) Problem - 1: Buffer in matching machine is assumed, this contradicts the problem statements. (-5) Problem - 2: Output could be improved (e.g., message could be shown when updation is not possible) (-3) Problem - 3:Address of delivery is not there (-	80

		5) unavailability of a particular item is not shown explicitly at the time of order (-5)	
Group-23	S Sai Harshavardhan 150101075	seems little less contribution ,No commenting on code , Ques 3 fails for some test cases , some java concept are not clear , report is okey	65
	Dharmesh Chourasiya 150101022	No commenting on code , Ques 3 fails for some test cases, answered most of the ques, report is okey	77
Group-24	Piyush Jain 150101046	All case was not considered in the report (-5) Code documentation was not complete(-3) The code was not generic (-5)	87
	Shivam Gupta 150101068	All case was not considered in the report (-5) Code documentation was not complete(-3) The code was not generic (-5) Not clear about all code(-5)	82
Group-25	Sudhanshu Ranjan 150101076	Fails for some test cases for ques 1 , NO commenting in code , report is okey	80
	Ankit Kumar Singh 150101086	less contribution in assignment , Fails test cases for ques 1 , not able to answer some question	65
Group-26	Priyankar Jain 150101088	No commenting in codes ,First ques not able to answer some ques , report is okey	78
	Shashank Anil Huddedar 150101085	less contribution , NO commenting in codes , not able to explain code and answer ques	68
Group-27	Patoliya Meetkumar Krushnadas 150101045	less contribution in assignment , Ques 3 is not properly implemented ,No commenting in codes	65
	Shubham Singhal 150101072	Ques 3 is not properly implemented , No commenting in the code, report is okey	77
Group-28	Bishwenrda choudhary 150101017	very less contribution in the assignment , not able to explain the code properly , ques no 3 some test cases fails	60
	Tamil selvan 150101079	ques no 3 some test cases fails , report is okey , no commenting in code	80
Group-29	Anup Agarwal 150101009	explained code well , no commenting in code , report is okey	90
	Surabhi Gupta 150101078	explained the codes well , no commenting in code , report is okey	90
Group-30	Shradha Pruthi 150101070	Question #3 Not done (Deducting 50 marks) Sorting is not implemented in #2 (Deducting 5 marks from 30 marks) #1 is good. Every functionality mentioned in the assignment is done. Report is good. **[Implemented less]**	40

	Bhavya Bansal 150101015	Question #3 Not done (Deducting 50 marks) Sorting is not implemented in #2 (Deducting 5 marks from 30 marks) #1 is good. Every functionality mentioned in the assignment is done. Report is good.	45
Group-31	V Sony Venkatesh 150101080	Question #1 is not understood well. Basic functionality of concurrency was missing. (Deducting 10 marks) Question #2 is fine. Question #3 was not running for multiple requests though the stock is available. (Deducting 15 marks) Report is fine.	75
	Sai Shobith 150101032	Question #1 is not understood well. Basic functionality of concurrency was missing. (Deducting 10 marks) Question #2 is fine. Question #3 was not running for multiple requests though the stock is available. (Deducting 15 marks) Report is fine.	75
Group-32	Ayush singh 150101013	Question #1 is done properly. Question #2 and #3 are not done. (Deducting 80 marks) Report is overall good.	20
	Aman agarwal 150101005	Question #1 is done properly. Question #2 and #3 are not done. (Deducting 80 marks) Report is overall good.	20
Group-33	Mukkoti Anil Kumar 150101037	Question #3 is not done. (Deducting 50 marks) Question #1 and #2 are fine. Report is good. Somewhat lagging in threading knowledge. (Deducting 10 marks)	40
	Muddada Nitesh Kamal 150101036	Question #3 is not done. (Deducting 50 marks) Question #1 and #2 are fine. Report is good. Somewhat lagging in threading knowledge. (Deducting 10 marks)	40
Group-34	Shashank Garewal 150101067	Question #2 is not done. (Deducting 30 marks) Question #3 is done but not working. Logic and understanding was right but not able to show the output. (Deducting 30 marks) Question #1 is good. Report is overall nice.	40
	Jignyasu Chasmawala	Question #2 is not done. (Deducting 30 marks)	

	150101028	Question #3 is done but not working. Logic and understanding was right but not able to show the output. (Deducting 30 marks) Question #1 is good. Report is overall nice. **[less contribution]**	30
Group-35	SAMRAT YADAV 150101056	Question #3 not done (Deducting 50 marks) Question #2 not showing correct output in some cases. (Deducting 15 marks) Question #1 is fine. Report is good.	35
	G SHARATH KUMAR 150101023	Question #3 not done (Deducting 50 marks) Question #2 not showing correct output in some cases. (Deducting 15 marks) Question #1 is fine. Report is good.	35
Group-37	mayank agrawal 150101033	Question #3 not done (Deducting 50 marks) Question #2 partial working (Not working in case of without syn) - Deducting 10 marks Question #1 is fine Report is good.	40
	ayush soni 150101014	Question #3 not done (Deducting 50 marks) Question #2 partial working (Not working in case of without syn) - Deducting 10 marks Question #1 is fine Report is good.	40
Group-38	Shubham Jindal 150101071	**Problem - 1:** Matching machine can store socks, this assumption contradicts the problem statements (-5). **Problem - 2:** OK **Problem - 3:** Shop owner is unable to know where to deliver an order (-5) Sales and purchase list are not generated (-20) **CODE:** Coding style is good and codes are well documented. **REPORT:** Readability (-2)	68
	Saurav Kejriwal 150101063	**Problem - 1:** Matching machine can store socks, this assumption contradicts the problem statements (-5). **Problem - 2:** OK	

		Problem - 3: Shop owner is unable to know where to deliver an order (-5) Sales and purchase list are not generated (-20) **CODE:** Coding style is good and codes are well documented. **REPORT:** Readability (-2)	68
Group-39	Ankit Vyas 150101008	**Problem - 1:** Assumption of extra buffers to store 100 socks, this contradicts the problem statements (-5). **Problem - 2:** Single teacher (TA/CC) cannot update a record (-10) **Problem - 3:** NOT DONE (-50) **CODE:** Codes are not documented (-10) **REPORT:** OK	25
	Ayush Jain 150101012	**Problem - 1:** Assumption of extra buffers to store 100 socks, this contradicts the problem statements (-5). **Problem - 2:** Single teacher (TA/CC) cannot update a record (-10) **Problem - 3:** NOT DONE (-50) **CODE:** Codes are not documented (-10) **REPORT:** OK	25
Group-40	Mohit Kumar 150101035	**Problem - 1:** OK **Problem - 2:** OK **Problem - 3:** GUI could be improved (-2) Purchase list is not produced (-10) Parallelism is not shown explicitly (-3) **CODE:** Coding style is very good and codes are very well documented. **REPORT:** Good	85

	Nikunj Mittal 150101043	**Problem - 1:** OK **Problem - 2:** OK **Problem - 3:** GUI could be improved (-2) Purchase list is not produced (-10) Parallelism is not shown explicitly (-3) **CODE:** Coding style is very good and codes are very well documented. **REPORT:** Good	85
Group-41	Harshit Bansal 150101026	**Problem - 1:** Arm can identify color which contradicts the problem statement, means there is no role of matching machine (-5) **Problem - 2:** OK **Problem - 3:** NOT DONE (-50) **CODE:** Coding style is very good and codes are very well documented. **REPORT:** Report is made in very casual way. Not good at all. (-10)	35
	Mayank Yadav 150101034	**Problem - 1:** Arm can identify color which contradicts the problem statement, means there is no role of matching machine (-5) **Problem - 2:** OK **Problem - 3:** NOT DONE (-50) **CODE:** Coding style is very good and codes are very well documented. **REPORT:** Report is made in very casual way. Not good at all. (-10)	35
Group-42	SHAHWAR FATIMA 150101064	**Problem - 1:** OK **Problem - 2:** Tried well but some errors are there, marks have been given for the honesty and efforts made (-15) **Problem - 3:**	25

		NOT DONE (-50) **CODE:** Not documented (-5) **REPORT:** Not good (-5)	
	Soumik Roy 150101074	**Problem - 1:** OK **Problem - 2:** Tried well but some errors are there, marks have been given for the honesty and efforts made (-15) **Problem - 3:** NOT DONE (-50) **CODE:** Not documented (-5) **REPORT:** Not good (-5)	25
Group-43	B HITESH VAMSHI 130101013	**ABSENT** (Did not want to be evaluated)	0
	BHOLA SHANKAR RATHIA 150101016	**ABSENT** (Did not want to be evaluated)	0
Group-44	KRISHNA KUMAR 150101030	**ABSENT** (Did not want to be evaluated)	0
	PRAVEEN JANGID 150101048	**ABSENT** (Did not want to be evaluated)	0