| <b>Evaluation Item</b>  | 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.   |
| Evaluation Item   | Unacceptable (0)  | Marginal (1-2)  | Proficient (3)   | Mark: 1/1 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: 2/3  |

| 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. |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
|                                |  |  | - 6 (0)  | Mark: 3/3   |
| Evaluation Item  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:**

• None.

## **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: 9/10