

Evaluation Item	Unacceptable (0)	Acceptable (1)		Comments
<b>Verifiability</b> <u>Note:</u> If this item is “unacceptable”, the rest of the assignment will not be marked.	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 script can be used on a lab machine to verify the parser outputs.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Everything required to verify the compiler is included</li> </ul> <div>1/1</div>
Evaluation Item	Unacceptable (0)	Marginal (1-2)	Proficient (3)	Comments
<b>Correctness</b>	<p>The extension or optimization has broken the compiler’s ability to generate code in many cases.</p> <p>There is only no optimization technique employed correctly and/or the optimization techniques employed are subpar.</p>	<p>The extension or optimization has caused the compiler to fail in edge cases.</p> <p>There is only one optimization technique employed correctly and/or there is no substantially implemented optimization technique.</p>	<p>The compiler continues to generate legal code with the extension or optimization enabled.</p> <p>There are two or more optimization techniques employed, one of which is substantial.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The compiler continues to generate legal code.</li> <li>Sufficient number of optimizations implemented.</li> </ul> <div>3/3</div>

<b>Robustness</b>	<p>The extension or optimization only works on a very narrow set of cases. Alternatively, no extension or optimization is present.</p> <p>Type checking (if applicable) does not function as expected and/or has major errors.</p>	<p>The extension or optimization fails to account for some edge cases or rules out some common cases.</p> <p>Type checking (if applicable) functions with minor errors.</p>	<p>The extension or optimization is capable of handling unexpected or incorrect input gracefully.</p> <p>Type checking (if applicable) functions as expected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing test cases which checks for potential errors. Deducting 0.5 for this.</li> <li>• With brief testing, the compiler seems to handle error cases.</li> </ul> <p>2.5/3</p>
<b>Documentation</b>	<p>The extension is not clearly identified or the document does not explain its purpose. Alternatively, there is no documentation to support the submission.</p> <p>The documentation includes minor or no details on how to run the test script for verifiability and provides minor or no details to test the compiler/interpreter.</p>	<p>The extension is identified clearly, however, the documentation fails to distinctly illustrate/explain how it is implemented or why it is interesting.</p> <p>The documentation includes some details on how to run the test script for verifiability and provides some details to test the compiler/interpreter.</p>	<p>The extension or optimization is identified clearly. The document explains what it does, how it is implemented, and why it is interesting.</p> <p>The documentation includes details on how to run the test script for verifiability and provides sufficient details to test the compiler/interpreter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation clearly indicates optimization implemented and how it is done.</li> </ul> <p>3/3</p>

**Additional Notes:**

- Minor problem of 1 unused token (no mark deducted).

**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	sibiana

**Score: 9.5 /10**