

# MPI: Self Evaluation Report

## 2<sup>nd</sup> revision

Dan Cojocaru  
Computer Science in English  
2020  
Email: `dan.cojocaru00@e-uvt.ro`

July 11, 2020

### Summary

Self evaluation, total ~~9.0~~ **9.7** points, as follows:

1. Report presentation: 1 p
2. Paper: ~~4.5~~ **2.2** points, as follows:
  - (a) Initial paper: 0.0 points,
  - (b) EasyChair paper: 1.5 points,
  - (c) Final paper: ~~0.0~~ **0.7** points.
3. Evaluation reports for EasyChair papers: 2.8 points.
4. Presentation: 3.7 points, as follows:
  - (a) scenario: 1.3 points,
  - (b) presentation: 1.6 points,
  - (c) presentation attendance: 0.8 points,
5. Computer Science map: 0.0 points.

## **1 Report presentation (1 p): „din oficiu”**

### **2 Paper (2.2 p)**

#### **2.1 Initial paper (0 p)**

I did not write the initial paper.

#### **2.2 EasyChair paper (1.5 p - borderline)**

According to the decision received on email via EasyChair, I have received 1.5 points for my EasyChair paper.

#### **2.3 Final paper: (0.7 p)**

I have corrected and improved my paper into a 2<sup>nd</sup> revision as follows:

- I have filled in the "Reading instructions" section of the paper which I negligently forgot to fill the first time.
- I removed the "List of Figures" section that I forgot to remove from the template since my paper does not contain any figures.
- I have completed the "Approach" section with further details in order to aid the creation of another implementation in order to test my paper. Furthermore, I have added details about my implementation.
- I have revised the "Related Work" section by replacing some that were not exactly related and including a short summary for each in order to allow the reader to make a decision about reading further into the related work to get more information and also about how my paper relates to them.
- In the "Future Work" section, I added a discussion about a suggestion I received while presenting my paper, namely that Quick Sort might give unreliable results due to choosing of a random pivot, sometimes choosing a badly performing one.

## **3 Paper evaluation via EasyChair (2.8 p)**

- Review for paper 42: 0.8 p
- Review for paper 69: 1.0 p
- Review for paper 88: 1.0 p

## **4 Presentation (3.7 p)**

### **4.1 Presentation preparation - "the scenario" (1.3 p)**

According to the comment received on Google Classroom, quoted below, I received 1.3 points for the scenario.

Missing from the script: phases of presentation - motivation, learning, association.

## **4.2 Presentation (1.7 p)**

A short report related to the presentation is attached to this one.

## **4.3 Presentation attendance (0.8 p)**

I have attended 4 presentation sessions. I asked 2 questions for one presentation, and 1 question for 3 presentations. I have also written a short review for one presentation, attached to this report.

## **5 Computer Science map (0 p)**

I did not create a Computer Science map.

# Presentation Report

The presentation went overall well.

I did stutter for the first part, but I did get a hold of myself and finished the presentation smoothly.

It would seem that my goal of getting people more interested into viewing problems in a less traditional way, and in particular getting people interested into optimising for slow internet and chunking, has been reached.

There have been many interesting questions.

# Presentation Review

## Presentation of Dragoş Ursan

The introduction of each algorithm was comprehensive, making sure even the audience who is not familiar with them understood them at least on a very basic level, even though the introduction took about 6 minutes.

The process of comparing the algorithms was also explained in detail.

I have never heard of comb sort or shell sort before this presentation, so including them was certainly a good addition!

Reaching the conclusion that shell sort is better than quick sort on small arrays is a very interesting result.