



RUBRICS FOR SDP I (FINAL PRESENTATION ASSESSMENTS)



Project Title		Project Advisor	
Batch		Evaluator Name	

		Students Name															
		ID															
PLO	Criteria	Scores	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
PLO 1 Engineering Knowledge	R1 Subject Knowledge																
PLO 2 Problem Analysis	R2 Problem Statement																
PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	R3 Project Design Program																
PLO 4 Investigation	R4 Analysis and Approach																
PLO 9 Individuals and Team work	R5 Team work																
PLO 10 Communication	R6 Presentation and Viva																
PLO 11 Project Management	R7 Project Schedule and Milestone																
PLO 12 Lifelong Learning	R8 Novelty and Creativity																
		Total Score (TS) (Out of 40)	/ 40					/ 40					/ 40				

Comments: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Turn over for scoring rubrics)

Criteria	1 (0%-20%)	2 (20%-40%)	3 (40%-60%)	4 (60%-80%)	5 (80%-100%)	Complex Engineering Problem /Complex Engineering Activities
R1 Subject Knowledge PLO 1 Engineering Knowledge	Student has no knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer basic questions.	Student has no or very less knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer questions.	Student has less knowledge. Seems novice and can answer basic questions only.	Student has competent knowledge and is at ease with information. Can answer questions but without rationalization and explanation.	Student has presented full knowledge of both problem and solution. Answers to questions are strengthened by rationalization and explanation.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R2 Problem Statement PLO 2 Problem Analysis	Problem statement is not stated at all or vaguely stated.	Problem statement is stated but not entirely clear.	Problem statement is stated but lacks necessary justification in light of the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers necessary justification with reference to the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers sufficient justification. New reader can clearly understand its value and context.	WP1: Depth of knowledge WP3: Depth of analysis
R3 Project Design Program PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	The project is in initial phase and students fail to achieve the objectives approved till mid.	The project is in initial phase and students have achieved few objectives approved till mid.	The project is in design phase and students have achieved few objectives approved till mid.	The project is in design phase with moderate achievement of the objectives approved till mid.	The project is in execution phase with complete achievement of the objectives approved till mid.	WP1: Depth of knowledge WP3: Depth of analysis
R4 Analysis and Approach PLO 4 Investigation	Unable to plan and set objectives for the realization of the project. Correct approach to solve the project is not followed.	Adequate analysis of the project. Objectives have been set, but strategies to follow are not clearly stated. Approach taken to solve the problem is not satisfactory.	Adequate analysis of the project. Objectives have been set, but strategies to follow are not clearly stated. Approach taken to solve the problem is satisfactory.	Complete analysis of the project has not been done. Objectives have been set. Strategies to follow have been defined. Approach taken to solve the problem has been chosen.	Complete analysis of the project has been done. Objectives have been set. Strategies to follow have been defined. Approach taken to solve the problem has been chosen after thorough analysis.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R5 Team work PLO 9	Only one member appears to be actively	Few members have contributed to the project. Work	Not all members have contributed to the project. Work division	All members contributed. Work	All members contributed. Work division clearly mentioned	EA1: Range of resources

Individuals and Team work	working on the project.	division is not mentioned.	is not clearly mentioned.	division is not clearly mentioned.		
R6 Presentation and Viva PLO 10 Communication	Presentation was not clear at all. Language was not appropriate	Holds no eye contact with audience, as entire report is read from notes. Speaks in low volume which causes audience to disengage.	Displays minimal eye contact with audience, while reading mostly from the notes. Speaks in uneven volume with little or no inflection.	Consistent use of direct eye contact with audience, but still returns to notes Speaks with satisfactory variation of volume and inflection.	Holds attention of entire audience with the use of direct eye contact, seldom looking at notes. Speaks with fluctuation in volume and inflection to maintain audience interest.	EA1: Range of resources
R7 Project Schedule and Milestone PLO 11 Project Management	Project schedule as defined in the project proposal is not followed. Milestones have not been achieved.	Project schedule as defined in the project proposal is not followed. Milestones have not been very much achieved.	Project schedule as defined in the project proposal is followed for the most part. Some of the milestones have been achieved.	Project schedule as defined in the project proposal is followed. Some of the milestones have been achieved	All milestones are completed according to the timeline defined in project proposal	EA1: Range of resources
R8 Novelty and Creativity PLO 12 Lifelong Learning	Details of the project novelty are not discussed. The proposed solution is not novel.	Details of the project novelty are not briefly discussed. The novelty of the proposed solution is marginal.	Details of the project novelty are briefly discussed. The novelty of the proposed solution is marginal.	Details of the project novelty have been very much identified. The proposed solution is not novel.	Details of the project novelty have been identified. The proposed solution is novel.	WP3: Depth of analysis



RUBRICS FOR SDP I (FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENTS)



Project Title		Project Advisor	
Batch		Evaluator Name	

		Students Name			
		ID			
PLO	Criteria	Complex Engineering Problem (CEPs)			
PLO 2 Problem Analysis	R1 Literature Review & Problem Statement		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	R2 Methodology		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 4 Investigation	R3 Result & Conclusion		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 5 Modern Tool Usage	R4 Implementation & Testing		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 7 Environment and Sustainability	R5 Project Sustainability Impacts		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 8 Ethics	R6 Formatting Style and similarity index		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 10 Communication	R7 Language and Grammar, Formatting Style		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 11 Project Management	R8 Completeness and Accuracy		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Total CEPs Achieved			

Comments: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Turn over for scoring rubrics)

Criteria	1 (0%-20%)	2 (20%-40%)	3 (40%-60%)	4 (60%-80%)	5 (80%-100%)	Complex Engineering Problem /Complex Engineering Activities
R1 Literature Review & Problem Statement PLO 2 Problem Analysis	Literature review and problem statement is not stated at all or vaguely stated.	Literature review and Problem statement is stated but not entirely clear.	Problem statement is stated but lacks necessary justification in light of the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers necessary justification with reference to the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers sufficient justification. New reader can clearly understand its value and context	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R2 Methodology PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	The approach taken to solve the problem is not discussed.	Some aspects of the solution are discussed briefly but much of the description is left out.	The methods, approaches, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are discussed but not in a convincing manner.	The methods, approaches, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed.	The methods, approaches, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed with sufficient details.	WP2: Range of conflicting requirements
R3 Result & Conclusion PLO 4 Investigation	Results and conclusions of the solution are not provided.	Results and conclusion of the solution are briefly discussed without supporting figures and graphics	Results and conclusion of the solution are discussed with few supporting figures and graphics	Results and conclusion of the solution are discussed with supporting figures and graphics	A comprehensive result and conclusion of the solution is presented with supporting figures and graphics.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R4 Implementation & Testing PLO 5 Modern Tool Usage	System implementation and testing is not included at all or vaguely stated	System implementation is included but entirely in poor way. No system testing is performed	System implementation is included in ordinary way. However, Testing is not adequate enough to test the entire system	System implementation is added in good way and provides all the necessary details for the reader. System testing is performed in good way.	System implementation is added in excellent way and provides all the necessary details for the reader. System testing is performed in very good way.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R5 Project Sustainability Impacts	The project provides no engineering solutions in societal	The project provides no engineering solutions in societal and environmental	The project provides engineering solutions in societal and environmental	The project provides engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts	The project provides engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts	WP2: Range of conflicting requirements

PLO 7 Environment and Sustainability	and environmental contexts and demonstrate no knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	contexts and demonstrate poor knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	contexts and demonstrate average knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	and demonstrate good knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	and demonstrate excellent knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	
R6 Formatting Style and similarity index PLO 8 Ethics	Improper format and style of the report with very high similarity index.	The formatting of the chapters may need more improvement and high similarity index.	Formatting style is proper but figures and tables don't follow standard practice (caption figure number etc.) and high similarity index.	Formatting style of chapters, table of contents, title page, references and appendices are proper with minor correction and acceptable similarity index.	Formatting style of chapters, table of contents, title page, references and appendices are proper with acceptable similarity index.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R7 Language and Grammar PLO 10 Communication	A lot of spelling and grammatical mistakes.	Frequent spellings and grammatical errors that impede the reading flow	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors that have only minor impact on flow of reading.	Almost no spelling or grammatical mistake.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R8 Completeness and Accuracy PLO 11 Project Management	The system failed to produce the right accurate results.	The system execution led to inaccurate or incomplete results. It was not correctly functional or not all the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and most of the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented. It was demonstrated how the real-world problem was solved.	WP1: Depth of knowledge



RUBRICS FOR SDP II (FINAL PRESENTATION ASSESSMENTS)



Project Title		Project Advisor	
Batch		Evaluator Name	

		Students Name															
		ID															
PLO	Criteria	Scores	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
PLO 1 Engineering Knowledge	R1 Subject Knowledge																
PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	R2 Project Demonstration																
PLO 4 Investigation	R3 Investigation																
PLO 6 The Engineer and Society	R4 Impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context. (SDG)																
PLO 7 Environment and Sustainability	R5 Project Impact (SDG)																
PLO 8 Ethics	R6 Professional ethical values																
PLO 9 Individual and Team Work	R7 Team Work																
PLO 10 Communication	R8 Presentation and Viva																
		Total Score (TS) (Out of 40)	/ 40					/ 40					/ 40				

Comments: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

Criteria	1 (0%-20%)	2 (20%-40%)	3 (40%-60%)	4 (60%-80%)	5 (80%-100%)	Complex Engineering Problem /Complex Engineering Activities
R1 Subject Knowledge PLO 1 Engineering Knowledge	Student has no knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer basic questions.	Student has no or very less knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer questions.	Student has less knowledge. Seems novice and can answer basic questions only.	Student has competent knowledge and is at ease with information. Can answer questions but without rationalization and explanation.	Student has presented full knowledge of both problem and solution. Answers to questions are strengthened by rationalization and explanation	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R2 Project Demonstration PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	The project is in initial phase and students fail to achieve the objectives.	The project is in initial phase and students have achieved few objectives.	The project is in design phase and students have achieved few objectives.	The project is in design phase with moderate achievement of the objectives.	The project is in execution phase with complete achievement of the objectives.	WP1: Depth of knowledge WP3: Depth of analysis
R3 Investigation PLO 4 Investigation	The approach taken to solve the problem is not discussed.	Some aspects of the solution are discussed briefly but much of the description is left out.	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are discussed but not in a convincing manner. Much is left to the readers' imagination.	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed.	The methods, approaches, tools, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed with sufficient details and supporting figures.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R4 Impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context. PLO 6 The Engineer and Society	The project provides no impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context.	The project provides poor impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context.	The project provides an average impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context.	The project provides good impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context.	The project provides excellent impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental and societal context.	WP2: Range of conflicting requirements SDG
R5	The project provides no	The project provides no	The project provides engineering solutions in	The project provides engineering solutions in	The project provides engineering solutions in	WP1: Depth of knowledge

<p>Project Sustainability Impact</p> <p>PLO 7 Environment and Sustainability</p>	<p>engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate no knowledge of and need for sustainable development.</p>	<p>engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate poor knowledge of and need for sustainable development.</p>	<p>societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate average knowledge of and need for sustainable development.</p>	<p>societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate good knowledge of and need for sustainable development.</p>	<p>societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate excellent knowledge of and need for sustainable development.</p>	<p>SDG</p>
<p>R6 Professional ethical values</p> <p>PLO 8 Ethics</p>	<p>The student never reported to his supervisor.</p>	<p>Student reported occasionally to his supervisor. The student did not follow the timeline.</p>	<p>Student had few meetings. More are required. Some time he came prepared, other times he was not prepared.</p>	<p>Student held regular meetings with his supervisor.</p>	<p>Student held regular meetings with his supervisors and committee members. He reported his progress regularly</p>	<p>WP1: Depth of knowledge</p>
<p>R7 Team Work</p> <p>PLO 9 Individual and Team Work</p>	<p>Only one member did all the work. Conflicts between the group members were clearly visible.</p>	<p>Only one member did all the work. Other members could not answer basic questions about the project.</p>	<p>Not all members contributed to the project. Work division is not mentioned.</p>	<p>All members contributed to the project. Cooperation between group members was reasonable. Work division is mentioned.</p>	<p>All members contributed to the project. Any conflicts within the group members were amicably resolved. Work division is clearly mentioned.</p>	<p>EA1: Range of resources</p>
<p>R8 Presentation and Viva</p> <p>PLO 10 Communication</p>	<p>Presentation was not clear at all. Language was not appropriate</p>	<p>Holds no eye contact with audience, as entire report is read from notes. Speaks in low volume and/ or monotonous tone, which causes audience to disengage.</p>	<p>Displays minimal eye contact with audience, while reading mostly from the notes. Speaks in uneven volume with little or no inflection.</p>	<p>Consistent use of direct eye contact with audience, but still returns to notes. Speaks with satisfactory variation of volume and inflection.</p>	<p>Holds attention of entire audience with the use of direct eye contact, seldom looking at notes. Speaks with fluctuation in volume and inflection to maintain audience interest.</p>	<p>EA1: Range of resources</p>



RUBRICS FOR SDP II (FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENTS)



Project Title		Project Advisor	
Batch		Evaluator Name	

		Students Name			
		ID			
PLO	Criteria	Complex Engineering Problem (CEPs)			
PLO 2 Problem Analysis	R1 Literature Review & Problem Statement		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	R2 Methodology		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 4 Investigation	R3 Result & Conclusion		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 5 Modern Tool Usage	R4 Implementation & Testing		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 7 Environment and Sustainability	R5 Project Sustainability Impacts		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 8 Ethics	R6 Formatting Style and similarity index		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 10 Communication	R7 Language and Grammar, Formatting Style		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PLO 11 Project Management	R8 Completeness and Accuracy		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Total CEPs Achieved			

Comments: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Turn over for scoring rubrics)

Criteria	1 (0%-20%)	2 (20%-40%)	3 (40%-60%)	4 (60%-80%)	5 (80%-100%)	Complex Engineering Problem /Complex Engineering Activities
R1 Literature Review & Problem Statement PLO 2 Problem Analysis	Literature review and problem statement is not stated at all or vaguely stated.	Literature review and Problem statement is stated but not entirely clear.	Problem statement is stated but lacks necessary justification in light of the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers necessary justification with reference to the literature review.	Problem statement is stated and covers sufficient justification. New reader can clearly understand its value and context	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R2 Methodology PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	The approach taken to solve the problem is not discussed.	Some aspects of the solution are discussed briefly but much of the description is left out.	The methods, approaches, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are discussed but not in a convincing manner.	The methods, approaches, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed.	The methods, approaches, techniques, algorithms, or other aspects of the solution are sufficiently discussed with sufficient details.	WP2: Range of conflicting requirements
R3 Result & Conclusion PLO 4 Investigation	Results and conclusions of the solution are not provided.	Results and conclusion of the solution are briefly discussed without supporting figures and graphics	Results and conclusion of the solution are discussed with few supporting figures and graphics	Results and conclusion of the solution are discussed with supporting figures and graphics	A comprehensive result and conclusion of the solution is presented with supporting figures and graphics.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R4 Implementation & Testing PLO 5 Modern Tool Usage	System implementation and testing is not included at all or vaguely stated	System implementation is included but entirely in poor way. No system testing is performed	System implementation is included in ordinary way. However, Testing is not adequate enough to test the entire system	System implementation is added in good way and provides all the necessary details for the reader. System testing is performed in good way.	System implementation is added in excellent way and provides all the necessary details for the reader. System testing is performed in very good way.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R5 Project Sustainability Impacts PLO 7	The project provides no engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and	The project provides no engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate poor	The project provides engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate average	The project provides engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate good knowledge of and need	The project provides engineering solutions in societal and environmental contexts and demonstrate excellent knowledge of	WP2: Range of conflicting requirements

Environment and Sustainability	demonstrate no knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	knowledge of and need for sustainable development.	for sustainable development.	and need for sustainable development.	
R6 Formatting Style and similarity index PLO 8 Ethics	Improper format and style of the report with very high similarity index.	The formatting of the chapters may need more improvement and high similarity index.	Formatting style is proper but figures and tables don't follow standard practice (caption figure number etc.) and high similarity index.	Formatting style of chapters, table of contents, title page, references and appendices are proper with minor correction and acceptable similarity index.	Formatting style of chapters, table of contents, title page, references and appendices are proper with acceptable similarity index.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R7 Language and Grammar PLO 10 Communication	A lot of spelling and grammatical mistakes.	Frequent spellings and grammatical errors that impede the reading flow	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors	Occasional spellings and grammatical errors that have only minor impact on flow of reading.	Almost no spelling or grammatical mistake.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R8 Completeness and Accuracy PLO 11 Project Management	The system failed to produce the right accurate results.	The system execution led to inaccurate or incomplete results. It was not correctly functional or not all the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and most of the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented. It was demonstrated how the real-world problem was solved.	WP1: Depth of knowledge



RUBRICS FOR SDP II (FINAL DEMONSTRATION ASSESSMENTS)



Project Title		Project Advisor	
Batch		Evaluator Name	

		Students Name															
		ID															
PLO	Criteria	Scores	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	R1 Quality and Coding Standards																
PLO 5 Modern Tool Usage	R2 Modern Tool Usage																
PLO 8 Ethics	R3 Originality																
PLO 10 Communication	R4 Ways of Demonstration																
PLO 11 Project Management	R5 Completeness and Accuracy																
PLO 12 Lifelong Learning	R6 Novelty and Creativity																
		Total Score (TS) (Out of 30)	/ 30					/ 30					/ 30				

Comments: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Turn over for scoring rubrics)

Criteria	1 (0%-20%)	2 (20%-40%)	3 (40%-60%)	4 (60%-80%)	5 (80%-100%)	Complex Engineering Problem /Complex Engineering Activities
R1 Quality and Coding Standards PLO 3 Design/Development of solutions	Coding standards, best programming practices are not followed. Students cannot understand the code.	Coding standards, best programming practices are not followed.	Coding standards, best programming practices are rarely followed.	Coding standards, best programming practices are followed appropriately.	Coding standards, best programming practices are followed extensively	WP2: Range of conflicting requirements
R2 Modern Tool Usage PLO 5 Modern Tool Usage	Modern engineering software were not used, where applicable, to solve complex engineering problems.	Selection of the proper software tools is very poor and requires more familiarization with the modern tools.	Computer-based tools and technical software were used, but more could have been used to solve the problem.	Advanced and appropriate software tools were selected but its potentials were not fully explored and applied.	Modern computer-based tools and software were used extensively in the project. New software/language was learned as needed	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R3 Originality PLO 8 Ethics	Most part of the working product is copied.	Working product is uninspired and straightforward work with little to no creative potential.	Working product has some potential for making a creative contribution.	Working product has some creative /original /inventive element and a potential for making a creative contribution.	Working product has several creative /original /inventive /innovative elements and a clear potential for making a creative contribution.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R4 Ways of Demonstration PLO 10 Communication	The system does not fulfill the functional requirements.	It is not clearly demonstrated how the system fulfills its functional requirements.	It is demonstrated how the system fulfills some of its functional requirements.	It is demonstrated how the system fulfills most of its functional requirements.	It is clearly and effectively demonstrated how the system fulfills all of its functional requirements.	WP1: Depth of knowledge
R5 Completeness and Accuracy PLO 11 Project Management	The system failed to produce the right accurate results.	The system execution led to inaccurate or incomplete results. It was not correctly functional or not all the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and most of the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented.	The system was correctly functional and all of the features were implemented. It was demonstrated how the real-world problem was solved.	WP1: Depth of knowledge

<p>R6 Novelty and Creativity</p> <p>PLO 12 Lifelong Learning</p>	<p>Details of the project novelty are not discussed. The proposed solution is not novel.</p>	<p>Details of the project novelty are not briefly discussed. The novelty of the proposed solution is marginal.</p>	<p>Details of the project novelty are briefly discussed. The novelty of the proposed solution is marginal.</p>	<p>Details of the project novelty have been very much identified. The proposed solution is not novel.</p>	<p>Details of the project novelty have been identified. The proposed solution is novel.</p>	<p>WP3: Depth of analysis</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------