

Description	Deduction
CCFinder: No discussion of code clones within a file, between files in the same version, and between files from different versions.	0.1
Application: Application size has not been discussed	0.1
Application: Insufficient discussion of application size (e.g. only LOC)	0.05
Bonus: Extensive discussion of software evolution.	-0.25
CCFinder: Imprecise discussion of the type of clones that CCFinder can identify. CCFinder cannot identify Type 1 clones correctly as such due to, e.g., normalization.	0.1
CCFinder: No discussion of the kind of analysis performed by CCFinder (text-based, metrics-based, token-based, AST-based, PDG-based)	0.25
CCFinder: No discussion of the type of clones that CCFinder can identify	0.25
Discussion of the evolution: Incomplete discussion of triangular patterns	0.25
Discussion of the evolution: No discussion of major releases	0.35
Discussion of the evolution: No discussion of reengineering activities	0.35
Discussion of the evolution: Unsupported claims	0.5
Document organization	0.05
Document organization. Chapters are appropriate in longer manuscripts such as books or theses, while shorter ones, such as this report are more commonly organised in sections.	0.05
General issues: Bibliography and references	0.05
General issues: Capitalization.	0.025
General issues: Spelling and grammar	0.025
General issues: Typo	0.025
General issues: Word choice.	0.025
General: Capitalize classes of numbered objects: "As shown in Figure 1", "In Section 2 we discuss", etc.	0.05
General: Font and layout	0.05
Heat map: Coloring scheme not explained (you should have explained which color(s) correspond to higher/lower values).	0.25
Heat map: No difference in width/height of the cells	0.25
Heat map: No difference in width/height of the cells but the need to implement this difference is recognized in the report.	0.1
Heat map: No version indication	0.5
Heat map: Quality of the fonts in the axes labels (versions) should be improved.	0.25
Heat map: The choice of the same color for the lowest comparison value and for the lack of comparison in the upper triangle is confusing: it suggests that duplication between, say versions A and B, is different from duplication between versions B and A. You should have either presented a symmetric picture or grayed out the upper rectangle.	0.75
Heat map: The visualization is cluttered by text in the heat map cells.	0.6
Heat map: Unsuccessful version indication	0.25
Heat map: Visualization does not pass the color-blindness check http://www.vischeck.com/vischeck/	0.75
Insufficient discussion of major releases.	0.3
Introduction does not mention replication.	0.15
Introduction: irrelevant discussion of cloning as bad coding practice. In this assignment we study clones *between* versions of the same system, i.e., similarity of those two versions.	0.15
Introduction: the stated purpose of the assignment is wrong	0.2
LaTeX error	0.025
Missing data in bibliographic entries.	0.15
Paper by Livieri et al. is not cited.	0.1
Text literally quoted from the Vuze website without adequately indicating the authorship.	0.25

The conclusions section is missing. However, since this has not been formally required in the assignment, no points will be deducted.	0
Tool: Auxiliary software has been developed but it has not been submitted	1
Tool: No adequate solution for overlapping clones	1
Tool: No discussion of how the minimal clone size is set.	0.25
Tool: Parameters of the command are not explained	0.25
Tool: Use of SLOC/CVRL. Recall that SLOC counts lines, excluding lines without any valid tokens. Here, the "tokens" are specific to CCFinderX. (For example, definitions of simple getters/setters in Java source file will be entirely neglected by CCFinderX.) This means that the values calculated differ from those in Livieri et al.	1.25
Tool: Wrong explanation of the command parameters	0.5
unclassified	0.5
Unsatisfactory discussion of the evolution	1.5
Workflow: Clone coverage is calculated based on tokens (LEN, CVR) rather than on lines (LOC)	1.5
Workflow: No normalization	0.25
Workflow: No normalization (visualization has been adapted to take the observed range into account).	0.1
Workflow: Redundant step	0.25
Workflow: RNR filtering applied to files rather than to clone data (Livieri et al. "the Repeated Token Ratio (RNR) metrics has been used to perform a filtering of the code clone data")	0.75
Workflow: The formula describing the code clone coverage ratio calculation does not correspond to the one by Livieri et al.	0.5
Workflow: Tokens (LEN) divided by lines (LOC). The values calculated differ from those in Livieri et al.	1.75
Workflow: Wrong RNR filtering [clone groups with RNR < 0.5 are kept instead of being eliminated]	1.25
Writing style	0.025
Writing style. It is customary to restrict the use of the future tense to discussions of the future work and sometimes introductions.	0.025
Wrong or unsupported statement	0.25
Wrong terminology	0.15