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 **+**.

Kaitlyn Higa

1a — You show some facility for handling digital visual information in terms of pixels and geometric primitives, but not in a totally effective manner, especially in how you dealt with the primitives code. (**|**)

2c — Your color computations are mostly decent, mainly in your filters. The gradient circle computations have some serious bugs though (see inline comments). (**/**)

3b — You didn't quite get the dashed line right, and as mentioned your gradient circle as some serious failure cases. Both detract from your ability to implement 2D graphics primitives. (**/**)

3c — Your filters have decent interest and variety. (**+**)

4a — Portions of your code are functional and technically correct. But as mentioned, there are some serious bugs in your primitives code (one leading to an infinite loop!). There is also consistent misuse of the conditional expression—remember, it's an *expression*, not a statement! There is definitely room to improve in this outcome. (**/**)

4b — The separation of concerns outcome takes a hit on two counts: first is your decision to "mash up" the `Nanoshop` and `NanoshopNeighborhood` objects. I can see some good reasons for this, but the way it was done, plus the lack of commentary on why you did something that was not absolutely necessary, casts some doubt on your understanding of good design. In addition, your `dBlur` filter, which requires a parameter beyond just the pixel neighborhood, was not implemented in the most reusable manner. These kinds of code modification are worth discussing with me if they come up. (**/**)

4c — Your single-pixel filter and primitives code is generally readable, but for some reason your neighborhood filter code takes a nosedive in readability: bad indentation and inconsistent spacing routinely mar the readability of this code. Readability issues are also compounded by your `Nanoshop` + `NanoshopNeighborhood` mashup—the neighborhood `applyFilter` function was given a new but suboptimal name, and the mixture of filter types just makes the object overall harder to understand. (**/**)

4d — Your resource and information use could definitely use improvement here on a number of counts, including the bugs in your primitives code, the issue with conditional expressions, the design mixup in your neighborhood filter code, etc. (**/**)

4e — Your work pacing and commit messages are marginally OK (example, for commit 04aea270956a69a9a0d42b98bf5e9f649c9794ba, your message was "however still need to figure out streaks in first two circles"—sure, it's useful to take note of what needs to be done, but what *did* you change for this particular commit?). In addition, you need to be more conscious of what you commit and when—there are a few instances where your commit message pertains to, say, the primitives code, and yet there are some *nanoshop* files that are riding along on that same commit. This makes it difficult to fully understand how your work proceeded. (**/**)

4f — Mostly submitted on time, with some additions and bug fixing taking place after the deadline. (**|**)