

- | Deduction | Description |
|-----------|---|
| 0,05 | Grammar and spelling |
| 0,05 | Layout and presentation |
| 0,1 | Question |
| 1,7 | Object-Flow Graph has not been implemented |
| 0,1 | Vague statement |
| 0,1 | No distinction between static and non-static fields |
| 0,2 | No discussion of the tool performance (eLib). |
| 0,2 | No discussion of the tool performance (CyberNeko). |
| 0,15 | Output: No discussion of roles |
| 0,1 | No discussion of the tool precision (CyberNeko). |
| 0,15 | Output: No discussion of cardinalities |
| -0,15 | Bonus: the user can hide/show fields and methods in the class diagram |
| 0,2 | Basic relation (associations, dependencies) extraction has not been implemented |
| 0,3 | Changes in CyberNuxeo have not been related to mail archives or change logs |
| 0,2 | No discussion of the visual quality of the diagrams produced (eLib). |
| 0,25 | Missing element in the discussion of a CyberNeko class diagram |
| 0,2 | No discussion of the visual quality of the diagrams produced (CyberNeko). |
| 0,5 | Discussion does not relate the findings with the design decisions. |
| 0,15 | Output: No discussion of named associations |
| 0,1 | Basic class information (method names, field names) extraction has not been |
| | Incomplete implementation of the object-flow graph: extracting elements from |
| 0,1 | collections not supported |
| 0,3 | Library classes not excluded from the class diagram. |
| 0,15 | Relating changes in CyberNuxeo to mail archives or change logs should be |
| 1 | No discussion |
| 0,1 | Wrong terminology |

