This document contains test reports of all fellow classmates and explanations of motivations behind each test. Tests will be for correctness, memory usage and timing when applicable.

1 Anagrams

1.1 Correctness:

To test for correctness we had seven test cases:

Case	String
1	''a''
2	''abc''
3	''aaa''
4	''cabcab''
5	''annamalis''
6	''aaaaaaaabb''
7	"qwertyuiop"

The reasoning behind each case is as follows:

Note: For the last 3 cases, we know that the java HeapSpace = 2,097,152 bytes and that 10! = 3,628,800 where as 9! = 362,880.

- 1. Base case to see if the algorithm will print out just a single string.
- 2. Just a simple input meant to easily check for correctness and to see if the algorithm is overkill when it comes to time complexity and/or space usage.
- 3. This is meant to test and see if the student's code can handle a string of all the same character, yet still be an easy case.
- 4. Tests students ability to handle unsorted and longer strings with repeating letters.
- 5. We use "annamalis" so as to test the 9 character correctness aspect. If the students were to use all of the space and store repeats, it would not time out in the system, but it would show up in our space analysis section where as if they did not store the extra strings, it would also show in the space analysis.
- 6. If students ignore all of the repetitions, they would pass this case since it would only be $\frac{10!}{8!\cdot 2!} = 45$ strings being stored.
- 7. Expect any algorithm which requires storage of all of the numbers to fail this case.

Collaborators: Page 1 of 6

The results were	The	$e\ results$	were:
------------------	-----	--------------	-------

Group name	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7
Lyle & Derek	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed?
Viet & Christ	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Jon & Trung	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed?
Colin & Rafael	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Jiri & Ronak	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Josh & Parker	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed?
Brenda & Brendan	Failed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Lukas & Sharp	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed

The reason why we put "Passed?" for case 7 is because our program was unable to generate a complete list to check for correctness, however when compared to eachouther's output, we found them all to be the same. For everyone else who failed this case, it was because they had an Out of Memory error caused by exceeding the heap space allotted for the program.

1.2 Timing:

The results were (seconds):

Group name	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7
Lyle & Derek	0.002	0.008	0.007	0.016	0.956	0.014	87.732
Viet & Christ	0.308	0.196	0.088	0.133	1.384	0.080	—-
Jon & Trung	0.164	0.063	0.089	0.106	225.2	5.987	119.6
Colin & Rafael	0.128	0.074	0.098	0.085	1.136	0.081	
Jiri & Ronak	0.189	0.097	0.091	0.119	1.920	0.124	
Josh & Parker	0.060	0.057	0.055	0.075	1.225	0.088	108.1
Brenda & Brendan	0.111	0.084	0.083	0.109	1.171	0.118	—-
Lukas & Sharp	0.076	0.080	0.080	0.124	2.152	0.091	

For this Section, Lyle and Derek had the most optimized code for Timing due to the fact that they printed straight out onto the command line. Apart from this everyone else had very similar run time with the exception of Jon and Trung's code. This was mostly due to the fact that they consistently did checks for different cases whenever they encountered a new enumeration of the word i.e. if every character is the same.

1.3 Memory:

The results were (percent used of total memory):

Group name	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7
Lyle & Derek	3.4%	3.5%	3.4%	4.0%	16.9%	4.0%	19.2%
Viet & Christ	5.0%	5.1%	5.0%	5.6%	39.0%	5.6%	
Jon & Trung	5.1%	5.1%	5.1%	6.2%	23.2%	24.2%	25.3%
Colin & Rafael	5.1%	5.0%	5.1%	5.6%	40.6%	5.6%	
Jiri & Ronak	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	7.0%	78.8%	7.0%	—-
Josh & Parker	5.1%	5.1%	5.1%	5.6%	24.2%	5.6%	25.3%
Brenda & Brendan	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	6.1%	38.9%	6.1%	
Lukas & Sharp	5.2%	5.2%	5.2%	5.6%	40.5%	5.8%	

For this Section, Lyle and Derek had the most optimized code again for Memory due to the fact that they printed straight out onto the command line. Apart from this everyone else had very similar space usage with the exception of Jon and Trung's code when it came to case 6. We had expected to see a similar drop in memory usage for case 6, but because their code stored extra information for each word Jon and Trung's algorithm did significantly worse than all other groups.

1.4 Summary:

Group name	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7
Lyle & Derek	Passed						
Viet & Christ	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Jon & Trung	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed	Failed	Passed
Colin & Rafael	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Jiri & Ronak	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Josh & Parker	Passed						
Brenda & Brendan	Failed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Lukas & Sharp	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed

The only groups to pass all cases were Lyle & Derek and Josh & Parker.

2 Turtle Tokenizer

2.1 Correctness:

To test for correctness we had seven test cases:

Number	Token Input
1	''f10 R120''
2	''g10''
3	''x2{f60x30{10R60L10f}g16}''
4	''f60x30{10R60L10f}g16''
5	''10R60L10f''
6	''yolo''
7	''x2{f60x30{10R60L10f}g16''

The reasoning behind each case is as follows:

- 1. Base case to see if the algorithm will correctly parse two basic commands with camel case
- 2. An invalid entry which has numbers still to see if the program will output anything
- 3. Tests if the student's code can correctly return a multiplyer command with its corresponding braces, with nested braces.
- 4. Tests the student's code ability to return multiple commands with a multiplyer and an invalid entry
- 5. Tests if the code identifies a missing letter at the beginning and the precense of a stand alone valid entry
- 6. Tests to see if students ignore invalid single letters but can pick up on valid single letter entries
- 7. Tests to see if the students code is able to catch an illegal entry (missmatched brackets) and throw the correct exception

The results were:

Group name	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5	Case 6	Case 7
Lyle & Derek	Failed						
Viet & Christ	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Passed	Failed
Jon & Trung	Passed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Passed
Colin & Rafael	Passed	Passed	Passed	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed
Jiri & Ronak	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed
Josh & Parker	Passed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed
Brenda & Brendan	Passed	Failed	Passed	Failed	Failed	Failed	Failed
Lukas & Sharp	Passed						

Lyle & Derek print everything out two times due to a print statement within their code; if commented out they would pass cases 1 and 3. They fail other cases because they return invalid tokens and do not throw the correct exception when mismatched brackets are inputed. \Diamond Viet & Christ fail because they return invalid tokens and do not throw the correct exception when mismatched brackets are inputed. \Diamond Jon & Trung fail because they are unable to handle invalid inputs and go into infinite loops \Diamond Colin & Rafael fail case 5 because they could not seperate two tokens and failed the last case becasue they do not throw the correct exception when mismatched brackets are inputed. \Diamond Jiri & Ronak fail because they return invalid token tokens and do not throw the correct exception when mismatched brackets are inputed. \Diamond Josh & Parker fail because they have Invalid Character Input Exception and String Index Out of Bounds exceptions when there are invalid inputs. \Diamond Brenda & Brendan fail because they return invalid tokens and do not throw the correct exception when mismatched brackets are inputed.

2.2 Timing & Memory:

For this file, there was little to no difference in run time or memory usage as all had around 0.001 seconds to run each case and took 2.6% memory

3 Turtle Graphics

3.1 Correctness:

To test for correctness we had seven test cases:

Number	String
1	''F3 -> F10''
2	''F1 -> X3{F1{R2L3}}''
3	''F1 F2''
4	''F -> ABC''
5	''F -> X''
6	''L -> R, R -> L''

We began by running the program with the order-3 Snowflake:

X3 {F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 R60 F3 R60 F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 L120 F3 R60 F3 L12

Then we did the above tests for the following reasos:

- 1. Base case for basic correctness
- 2. Check for multiple tokens
- 3. Check for missing "->" error
- 4. Check for swapping invalid tokens
- 5. check for "Missing command block" error when running
- 6. Check for swapping two tokens

Every team was able to pass every test.

3.2 Timing & Memory:

There was no way to accurately test for timing or memory usage.