

NET103 MARIE Assembly Coursework Feedback

2017-2018

Student: 10072XXX

Group: M18- 3

May 24, 2018

Assessment methodology:

To allow consistency in marking, all submissions have been marked by Frederico Belmonte Klein and reviewed by Dr Maria Papadaki, using the following methodology:

1. The .mas file was initially loaded onto the MARIE code editor and assembled to produce the .mex executable file. The .mex file was then loaded onto the MARIE simulator for further testing. After each calculation, the file was reloaded to enable resetting of variables and register values (variable clean-up is not necessary). If an error occurred, the simulator was reset and the .mex file reloaded so that testing could continue with a clean environment.
2. If present, the routine to calculate the functionality was examined against the following automated tests (see subsections below) using a batch marie-simulator¹ for positive integer division routine (runtime limited to 10E5 operations) and for primality test (runtime limited to 10E6 operations). If an unexpected result was found, such input was tested also on the java Marie Simulator.

If incorrect results were produced, then further testing commenced as to understand how the algorithm works. At the same time, the assembly code .mas file was reviewed to check the student's understanding of the problem, the range of values it can work with, the use of subroutines with JNS and Jmpl instructions, as well as the subroutine code itself.

Division

Normal division expected operation should work for the following values can be seen in the table below:

¹Available at <https://github.com/mysablehats/marie-sim>

Inputs		Expected output		Your output	
Dividend	Divisor	Quotient	Rest	Quotient	Rest
0	1000	0	0	0	0
2	1	2	0	2	0
145	12	12	1	12	1
233	123	1	110	1	110
32767	500	65	267	65	267

Division: error handling

It was not a part of the assignment to divide negative numbers, however, it is expected that your program identifies wrong input and handle them without giving wrong results or worse, entering infinite loops. The expected results and outputs of your algorithm can be seen in the table below:

Inputs		Expected output		Your output	
Dividend	Divisor	Quotient	Rest	Quotient	Rest
0	0	Err. ¹		0	0
1	0	Err. ¹		0	1
-11	1	Err. ¹ or -11 rest 0		0	-11
11	-1	Err. ¹ or -11 rest 0		0	11
-1	-1	Err. ¹ or 1 rest 0		0	-1

¹Err. stands for the standard behaviour for invalid input you implemented in your code. Either output a 0 or -1 (a good idea in this case, since negative numbers were not used, so they shouldn't be expected to given as answers) or have the program halt without giving any result. ²Execution stopped after 10E5 operations.

Prime numbers

The test for primality was done for the numbers 1..7 and the randomly chosen not prime large odd numbers (201 and 649) and large primes (89 and 577) as can be seen in the table below:

Input ¹	Expected Output	Your output
1	0	??? ²
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	0	0
5	1	1
6	0	0
7	1	1
89	1	1
201	0	0
577	1	1
649	0	0

¹ List of primes from:

<https://primes.utm.edu/lists/small/10000.txt>

²Execution stopped after 10E6 operations.

Prime numbers: error handling

The test for primality was done for the numbers on the limit range of the int16 input (-1, 0 and $32767 = 7 \times 31 \times 151$) to check for lower and upper bounds and using and the randomly chosen not prime large odd numbers ($899 = 29 \times 31$ and $4819 = 61 \times 79$) and large primes (983 and 4817). For this test the maximum number of operations was increased to 10E6. Expected results and results of the presented algorithm can be seen in table below:

Input ¹	Expected Output	Your output
-1	0 or Err.	1
0	0	1
899	0	0
983	1	1
4817	1 or Err.	1
4819	0 or Err.	0
32767	0 or Err.	??? ²

¹ List of primes from:

<https://primes.utm.edu/lists/small/10000.txt>

²Execution stopped after 10E6 operations.

Assessment Criteria:

Accuracy of Results

Does the .mas file compile and run on the MarieSim environment? Does the code produce accurate and expected results according to the documentation and the range of values? For a basic functionality, mostly positive small numbers will be considered. For more elaborate work, limit values and whether the functions can handle negative numbers (division: error handling) without outputting incorrect results will be considered.

Functionality and Efficiency

Does the code contain all requested functionality? Can it detect and deal with user errors and unexpected user input (i.e. input of negative numbers, or numbers larger than 100)? Does the algorithm implement efficient computations? The main points will be awarded on this topic if the user has thought of error handling, range checking and overflow handling. Finally, structure and correct use of subroutines (JNS and JUMPI) will be considered and necessary for awarding distinction grades and incorrect syntax (such as INPUT N, OUTPUT N or having an operation in the same line that a routine label is accessed by JNS – that will not ever run since it gets overwritten) were considered as preventing the group to get a distinction mark.

Documentation and commenting (points are additive)

Documentation should be included as comments in the .mas file to specify the intended execution of the code. This is particularly important in the case of errors and incorrect results. Also, the documentation should specify the range of values the programme can work with. Additionally, the documentation should mention what each part of the code (main code or subroutine) is doing.

Results:

Accuracy of Results: 21/40

Functionality and Efficiency: = 10/30

Documentation and commenting: 17/30

Overall Mark: 48/100

Comments:

Your group submitted a version of the division algorithm and testing for primality in MARIE assembly that does compile and runs with appropriate answers for most small numbers, successfully achieving the most of the desired results with the desired level of functionality on the parts that were submitted.

ACCURACY: For small positive numbers, the division works fine, and so does the primality test except for 1.

ELABORATE ACCURACY: The algorithm does not deal with unexpected input, having its range compromised by not giving the right answer for zero (not a prime as it has infinite divisors) and not handling large numbers efficiently.

FUNCTIONALITY, RANGE: Your algorithm has no parameter range checking for lower bounds or upper bounds. The structure of your submission was in the moulds as directed by the assignment and all information necessary to correct it was in the .mas file – not needing additional files for explaining your work. JNS and JUMPI are **not** used, to form proper stand-alone subroutines but the subroutine division is used on the implementation of your primality test, which was desirable. However this leads to a strange behaviour that when your function receives invalid values for the division (say 0/0), it runs the primality test twice. The algorithm does not show any functionality to implement efficient computation.

DOCUMENTATION:

Documentation, as comments, is present within the .mas file. The range in which your algorithm work is however **not** commented. But the comments are good, describing each subroutine's general behaviour and helping understand what the algorithm is doing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

As a recommendation for increasing marks for future work, we would recommend:

- Use JNS and JUMPI and subroutines as directed by the assignment
- Some sort of systematic error escaping with the same answer for all invalid input: considering your algorithm only deals with positive numbers, you could have chosen a negative number as error code
- Implement lower bound range check
- Check syntax of functions before using them: marie behaves permissively, treating the N in "INPUT N" as a comment, however your code doesn't show any indication that this was the intention. INPUT takes no arguments. Correct syntax is "INPUT" with nothing following it.
- Trying to extend the range in which your algorithm gives adequate results
- Write the range in which your algorithm works in your documentation
- Test your algorithm more before submitting to make sure it gives accurate results paying special attention to range limits (in this case negative numbers, 0, 1 and 32767)

OVERALL:

This is overall a fair submission, achieving most of the functionality desired for the task, that however suffers greatly from not using subroutines for the task, and with that, not having implemented some of the code structures that were desired for this assignment. Not implementing clean modularity and range checking were the most important aspects that made it impossible to award it a better grade.