| Student Name: | Noah Cherry | |
|---------------|-------------|--|
| _ | | |

| Grader Name: Kyle Buchmiller | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| Questions | Score | Total |
| Code Requirements | | |
| 1.) FizzBuzz | | |
| Requirements: Diff with solution fizzbuzz.sol (4 pts) This is all or nothing2 you started at 0 instead of 1 Used the algorithm correctly (10 pts) Correct code, even if the output doesnt match with diff. Naming is correct (1 pts) Source code "fizzbuzz.c" Out put file "fizzbuzz.out" | 13 | 15 |
| 2.) Function Timing | | |
| Requirements: Solution should be similar to sum.sol (8 pts) This can't be diffed. Everything but the last column should be the same as sum.sol Used the algorithm correctly (6pts) Used a for loop Used unsigned ints for input and output Time should be printed to 24 decimal places Naming is correct (1 pt) Source code "sum.c" Output file "sum.out" | 15 | 15 |
| 3.) Function Timing – Non Iterative | | |
| Requirements: Solution should be similar to sum_no_for.sol (8 pts) This can't be diffed. Everything but the last column should be the same as sum_no_for.sol -2 first column in your .out shouldn't exist Used the algorithm correctly (6pts) Uses the equation to calculate the sum (no loops) uses unsigned ints for input and output | 13 | 15 |

| Name in a constitution in | 1 | |
|---|----|-----|
| Naming is correct (1 pts) | | |
| Source code "sum_no_for.c" | | |
| Output file "sum_no_for.out" | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 4.) Written Answers – to_for_or_not_to_for.txt | | |
| Requirements: | | |
| Ask this for the questions 2 and 3. (5 pts each) | | |
| O What is the largest k before overflow? | | |
| o Is k the same for both functions? | | |
| Which is preferred? Why? -2 why do you prefer the | 8 | 10 |
| non-for method? There's an important reason for | | |
| why the non-for method is better | | |
| Should be reasonable answers (no for loop preferred, | | |
| overflow with the for loop). | | |
| 5.) Cube Root | | |
| Requirements: | 1 | |
| Diff with solution cube_binary.sol (4 pts) -4 differs | | |
| • This is all or nothing. | | |
| Used the algorithm correctly (10 pts) | | |
| | | |
| | 10 | 4.5 |
| Accuracy is to 9 decimal places -1 should be for 9 | 10 | 15 |
| decimal places | | |
| O Uses binary search (6/10 pts) | | |
| Naming is correct (1 pts) | | |
| Source code "cube_binary.c" | | |
| Output file "cube_binary.out" | | |
| 6.) Newton's Square Root | | |
| Requirements: | | |
| Diff with solution newton_sqrt.sol (3 pts) -3 differs | | |
| This is all or nothing. | | |
| Used the algorithm correctly (6 pts) | | |
| Uses Newton's Method (5/6 pts) | | |
| Accuracy is to 9 decimal places -1 yours is 12 decimal | | |
| places | | |
| Naming is correct (1 pts) | | |
| Source code " newton sqrt .c" | 11 | 10 |
| Output file "newton_sqrt.out" | | |
| Output file flewton_sqrt.out | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 7.) Newton's Cube Root | | |
|--|----|-----|
| Requirements: • Diff with solution newton_cube.sol (3 pts)-3 not same • This is all or nothing. • Used the algorithm correctly (6 pts) • Uses Newton's Method (5/6 pts) • Accuracy is to 9 decimal places -1 this one is 8 decimal places • Naming is correct (1 pts) • Source code " newton_cube .c" • Output file " newton_cube.out" | 6 | 10 |
| Tar ball MUST be named (2/10 pts) cse122_fname_lname_hw0.tar.gz Must use a Makefile (2/10 pts) Must have doxygen comments (3/10 pts) -3 no doxygen comments Must have correct coding style (3/10 pts) 8 space tabs Proper bracket placement etc. | 7 | 10 |
| 5 6.6. | 83 | 100 |

| Good work overall! See above for where you lost points. The biggest issue was your outputs didn't diff properly with the .sol outputs. Other than that and your lack of doxygen comments, things looked great! |
|--|