| Evaluation Item | Unacceptable (0) | Acceptable (1) | | Comments | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Verifiability Note: If this item is "unacceptable", you must resubmit an "acceptable" version for the next sprint. | The submission lacks a script for validating the parser, or the script provided could not be used to verify the parser. | The submission includes (a) a set of tests for verifying the parser and (b) a script to build your parser and to parse those tests. That(/Those) script(s) can be used on a lab machine to verify the parser outputs. | | Everything that is required to verify the parser is present. Mark: 1/1 | |
| Evaluation Item | Unacceptable (0) | Marginal (1-2) | Proficient (3) | Comments | |
| Expressiveness Note: Typechecking is not required, so the parser may allow structurally correct but invalid code like: "cat" / 2 | The CFG and parser fail to disallow significant invalid structures. | The CFG and parser allow a small number of invalid structures. | The CFG and parser correctly represent the language, are free from ambiguity, and do not allow invalid structures. | Your parser outputs 13 shift/reduce conflicts during the generation of the state transition table, caused by the grammar ambiguity. Although PLY technically handles shift/reduce conflict by performing shift rather than reduce, your grammar should also handle this. | |
| | | | | Mark: 2.5/3 | |

| Completeness | The CFG and parser fail to parse significant portions of the language. | The CFG and parser fail to parse one or two legal structures. | The CFG and parser accurately represent all legal structures in the language. | Grammar looks good and your tests seem to test most (if not all) aspects of the language. |
|-----------------|--|--|--|---|
| Evaluation Item | Unaccontable (0) | Marginal (1.2) | Proficient (2) | Mark: 3/3 Comments |
| Documentation | The submission document is missing one of the required elements. | Marginal (1-2) The submission document contains all three required elements but does not clearly describe the IR or process for verifying the parser. | Proficient (3) The submission contains a document that (a) describes the IR clearly, (b) lists language structures not parsed, and (c) explains how to use the provided script and tests. | Nicely done. |
| | | | | Mark: 3/ 3 |

Additional Notes:

• An additional 0.5 mark was awarded for expressiveness after regrading.

Group Members:

| 1004042537 | BHARDWAJ | RITVIK | ritvik.bhardwaj@mail.utoronto.ca | bhard118 |
|------------|----------|----------|----------------------------------|----------|
| 1005290855 | HU | HAOCHENG | hc.hu@mail.utoronto.ca | huhaoche |
| 1004432321 | SIBIA | NAAZ | naaz.sibia@utoronto.ca | sibianaa |

Overall Score: 9.5/10