



Pearson Edexcel

**International GCSE History
Paper 2 Breadth example answers**

April 2018

About this pack

The example answers contained in this pack are indicative of the types of answers students may produce in response to the exam questions. They should not be seen as answers to emulate in order to guarantee a certain level of achievement.

Paper 2: Section B: Breath Study in change

B2 Changes in medicine, c1848–c1948

(a) Explain **TWO** ways in which surgery in 1848 was different from surgery in 1905. (6)

Answer A

There were a lot of differences between surgery in 1848 and 1905. At the beginning they couldn't stop pain and by 1905 they had found about giving blood.

Examiner Comment

The answer has provided a simple comment about difference with limited information to support.

The answer would be marked at Level 1.

Answer B

Surgery improved in the years 1848-1905. The problems of pain was solved. Simpson discovered chloroform could be used as an anaesthetic. Pasteur helped people understand about germs and Lister showed how antiseptics could work. Joseph Lister began using a carbolic spray and the death rates from infection dropped dramatically. There was further improvement when Koch developed a steam steriliser which meant equipment and dressings could be sterilised

Examiner Comment

The answer has explained two differences (solving the problems of pain and lowering the death rate from infection) and has provided specific information about the topics to support the explanation. However, there are no explicit comparisons supported by specific information about both periods.

The answer would be marked at Level 2 for AO2 and AO1 for explaining differences with some specific support.

Answer C

Two ways in which surgery was different in 1905, compared to 1848 are anaesthetics and antiseptics.

In 1848 there were no reliable forms of anaesthetics. Surgeons had used alcohol or opium and Liston had started using ether in the USA. But none of the methods was reliable. So patients suffered great pain and operations had to be done quickly. Mistakes were often made and patients sometimes died of shock. However, by 1905 anaesthesia was used. The work of Simpson had shown that chloroform was an effective anaesthetic and it was used widely. In 1884 it was discovered that cocaine could be an effective local anaesthetic. So surgery became safer as surgeons could now stop rushing and take more care.

Before Pasteur's work people did not know about germs and did not really understand the need for hygiene. So the tools the surgeon used and his own hands could take germs into the patient's body. Gangrene and sepsis were common and many people died after operations. By 1905, the germ theory was understood and antiseptics and sterilisers were used to keep wounds and instruments clean, and surgeons wore clean gowns and gloves. These methods greatly reduced the chances of wounds becoming infected during surgery in 1905 compared with 1848.

Examiner Comment

The answer clearly explains differences between 1848 and 1905 by looking at two key areas, anaesthetics and antiseptics. Explicit comparisons are made and specific information from both periods is provided to support the comparisons.

The answer would be marked at Level 3 for both strands - AO2 and AO1

Section B Question (a)

Targets: AO1 (2 marks) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

AO2 (4 marks) Explain, analyse and make judgements about historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple comment is offered about similarity(ies)/ difference(s) [AO2] Generalised information about the topic is included, showing limited knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
2	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarities / differences are explained [AO2] Specific information about the topic is added to support the explanation [AO1] <p>Maximum 3 marks for an answer dealing with only one similarity/ difference.</p>
3	5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarities / differences are explained, making explicit comparisons [AO2] Specific information about both periods is added to support the comparison [AO1]

(b) Explain **TWO** causes of improvements in public health in Britain in the years 1848–78. (8)

Answer A

Public Health improved dramatically at this time because people got to understand much better what it was that causes the problems that existed. They knew about germs.

Examiner Comment

The answer gives a generalised account of why improvements took place, with very limited knowledge and understanding of the period.

The answer would be marked at Level 1 for a simple comment about causation, supported with generalised information.

Answer B

In 1848 there was no real understanding of the cause of disease. The Industrial Revolution had caused many people to move to towns where they often lived in damp and crowded, low quality accommodation. In 1848, thanks to the work of Chadwick, the government introduced the 1848 Public Health Act. This improved public health by setting up a General Board of Health and appointing commissioners. There was another Public Health Act passed in 1875 which improved public health by making local authorities provide clean water and making sure new housing was of a good standard.

Examiner Comment

The answer makes an attempt to explain how public health improved ('... 1848 Public Health Act. This improved health by...; '... 1875 which improved public health by....) but does not analyse features of the period sufficiently to explain causes beyond 'thanks to the work of ... ; the Government ...'. Instead a descriptive account of what happened is given. The answer contains specific information about the topic added into the answer with implied support for explanation.

The answer is borderline L1/L2 for AO2, with just sufficient explanation to merit Low L2. The answer reaches level two for AO1, but could not gain top level two overall, given the weaker performance in AO2.

Answer C

The reasons why there was an improvement in public health during these years were that there was much greater knowledge of what caused poor health and also that the government decided that it should play a greater role in looking after the people.

People such as Edwin Chadwick had begun to see a link between good health and living conditions. He was convinced that providing clean water and removing sewage would improve the health of the nation. John Snow investigated the outbreak of cholera in London and proved that it was carried by infected water from one particular pump. When you add to

this the fact that Pasteur developed his germ theory in 1861, there was a growing knowledge that poor standards of hygiene caused ill-health. It was this knowledge which led to the building of sewer systems in places like London, which all helped to improve public health by keeping water clean.

The role of the government was also an important reason for the improvement. Men like Chadwick and Snow could campaign for improvements, but ordinary people couldn't build their own water supply and sewers. Also while it was left to local authorities and rate payers, nothing was done in many towns. The idea of laissez-faire began to become less accepted and the government was more prepared to step in. The government introduced the 1866 Sanitary Act and the 1875 Public Health Act. Both of these acts said inspectors had to be appointed to make sure water supplies and sewers were improved in towns nationwide. So this led to better public health because the government took a greater role in making it happen.

Examiner Comment

The answer clearly explains two causes of the improvement in public health (greater knowledge and more government involvement) and provides detailed specific information to support the analysis.

The answer would be marked at Level 3 for AO2 and AO1 for analysing features of the period to explain how the causes led to the outcome (better public health) and providing accurate and relevant information to support the explanation.

Section B: Question (b)

Targets: AO1 (4 marks) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

AO2 (4 marks) Explain, analyse and make judgements about historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple comment is offered about cause(s). [AO2] • Generalised information about the topic is included, showing limited knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Features of the period are analysed to explain causes. [AO2] • Specific information about the topic is added to support the explanation. [AO1]
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Features of the period are analysed to explain causes and to show how they led to the outcome. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included to support the explanation, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]

(c) How far did the role of women in medicine change in the years 1848–1905? (16)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Florence Nightingale
- Elizabeth Garrett

You **must** also use information of your own.

Answer A

The role of women changed a lot in this period. At the start of the period women didn't have very much of a role in medicine, but thanks to the work of Florence Nightingale and Elizabeth Garrett they became respected as nurses and started to become doctors. So their role was very different.

Examiner Comment

The answer provides only a simple statement about change, with very limited knowledge shown and an unsupported assertion as judgement.

The answer would be marked at Level 1 for an answer lacking development and with very limited knowledge.

Answer B

There were important changes in the role of women and both Florence Nightingale and Elizabeth Garrett played a major part in bringing about those changes.

*Florence Nightingale brought about an important change in the role of women, because she made nursing a more respectable job. She first made her name working in military hospitals in the Crimean War, but it was in England where she made the greatest difference. Before Florence Nightingale began her work, nurses had no training, did not keep records of the patient's condition and some would turn up for work drunk. In 1859 Nightingale wrote a book called *Notes on Nursing* which set out a nurse's role in hospital. In the following year she opened a training school for nurses in London. As a result of this work nurses' role was considered to be more professional and important.*

Elizabeth Garrett also brought about a change in the role of women. Garrett decided that she wanted to be a doctor, but medical schools would not accept women. So Garrett worked as a nurse and paid for private lessons to train as a doctor. Eventually she was accepted to practise medicine and in 1873 became a member of the British Medical Association. She was the first woman to become a member of the BMA and was an inspiration to other women.

Examiner Comment

The answer has provided an explanation of the change that occurred in the role of women as a result of the work of Florence Nightingale and Elizabeth Garrett, though some of the answer drifts into analysis of causation rather than analysis of change. Accurate and relevant knowledge about the work of both women is provided but does not directly address 'How far' - the extent of change. The answer fails to recognise the limitations to changes in the role of women. This understanding of the feature of the period is missing and the justification for the judgement made (that there were important changes) is, therefore, insecure. The answer would be marked at Level 3 for both strand one (AO2) and for strand two (AO1), but only Level 2 for strand three (AO2).

Overall a best-fit judgment would place the work in Level three; level two is fulfilled for all three strands, and the answer reaches level three for two of them. However, a mark above mid-level three could not be awarded.

Answer C

Actually despite the work of people like Florence Nightingale and Elizabeth Garrett there was only a very limited change in the role of woman during this period. Florence Nightingale improved the standard of nursing and Elizabeth Garrett became a doctor, but was very much a 'one-off'

Florence Nightingale's work in Scutari resulted in a drop in the death rate of wounded soldiers and made people see nursing as a better job than it had been considered previously. She also wrote a book on how nurses should behave and started her own training school. Her own school of nurses produced around 2000 nurses by 1905 who were better trained and more skilled than nurses had been before. So her work was very important in raising standards in nursing and in making it acceptable for women to train as nurses. It did not, however, really change the role of women in medicine. They were still seen as people who were good at 'caring'. It was their job to look after the sick, but it was the men who were doctors and tried to cure people.

Elizabeth Garrett tried to challenge that view. She was inspired by the work of Elizabeth Blackwell who became a doctor in the USA and tried to attend lectures for male doctors so she could qualify as a doctor herself. But she met a lot of opposition, the medical schools would not accept female students, the male students in the medical schools complained when she tried to sit in the lectures and her own family were deeply upset that she wanted to become something as 'unwomanly' as a doctor. Elizabeth Garrett overcame all this opposition and the Society of Apothecaries was forced to accept her as qualified to practise medicine in 1865. However, it immediately changed its rules so no other woman could qualify to practise medicine. Elizabeth Garrett joined the British Medical Association in 1873, but it also then changed its rules to stop other women joining. So it doesn't seem that the role of women changed that much in the nineteenth century. There was an Act of Parliament in 1876 saying universities and medical schools should accept women to train as doctors, but there

will still only a few hundred studying medicine in 1905, compared to over 15,000 male doctors.

Examiner Comment

The answer clearly demonstrates an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and provides accurate and specific factual examples to support the analysis. The judgement shows a clear understanding of the characteristics of the second half of the nineteenth century.

The answer would be marked at Level 4 for strands one (AO2) and two (AO1) for a sustained and logical line of reasoning supported by precisely -selected information. The student's criteria for judgment (in the introduction '*one-off*' and at the end of paragraph two '*it was the men who were doctors*') are made clear, allowing the award of level four for strand three (AO2) also.

Section B: Question (c)

Targets: AO1 (7 marks) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

AO2 (9 marks) Explain, analyse and make judgements about historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A simple or generalised answer is given, lacking development and organisation. [AO2]• Limited knowledge of the topic is shown. [AO1]• The overall judgement is missing or asserted. [AO2]
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An explanation is given, showing limited analysis and with implicit links to the conceptual focus of the question. It shows some development and organisation of material but a line of reasoning is not sustained. [AO2]• Accurate and relevant information is added, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]• The overall judgement is given but its justification is asserted or insecure. [AO2] <p>Maximum 6 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</p>
3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An explanation is given, showing some analysis that is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2]• Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]• The overall judgement is given with some justification, but some criteria selected for the required judgement are left implicit or not validly applied. [AO2] <p>Maximum 10 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</p>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An analytical explanation is given that is directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question, showing a line of reasoning that is coherent, sustained and logically structured. [AO2]• Accurate and relevant information is precisely selected to address the question directly, showing wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]• Criteria for the required judgement are justified and applied in the process of reaching the overall judgement. [AO2] <p>No access to Level 4 for answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</p>

B6 The changing nature of warfare and international conflict, 1919–2011

- (a) Explain **TWO** ways in which guerrilla warfare in the conflict in Vietnam, in the years 1965–73, was similar to guerrilla warfare in Afghanistan during the Soviet occupation (1979–89). (6)

Answer A

I think the guerrilla warfare in Vietnam was very similar to the guerrilla warfare in Afghanistan. The Vietcong and the Mujaheddin both knew they couldn't defeat the more powerful enemy, so they avoided open conflict.

Examiner Comment

The answer has noted one similarity (that open conflict was avoided) but there is little factual support.

The answer would be marked at Level 1 for a simple comment, with only generalised information as support.

Answer B

Guerrilla warfare is a way of fighting when you want to avoid a pitched battle. If your enemy is much more powerful than you are, it doesn't make sense to have a battle with them. So what you have to do is to carry out hit and run attacks. In this type of warfare you carry out ambushes in territory where your enemy can't see you and you can surprise them. Or you carry out acts of sabotage to make it more difficult for your enemy to fight you. So if you don't have planes, helicopters and advanced equipment, that's what you have to do. That's what the Vietcong and the Mujaheddin both did.

Examiner Comment

The answer gives a description of guerrilla warfare and several similarities are implied, but not made explicit. At the end of the answer, there is a more direct attempt to link the knowledge of guerrilla tactics to the approach adopted by the Vietcong and Mujaheddin.

The answer would be marked at L1 for strand 1 (AO2), but L2 for strand 2 (AO1) for adding specific information. A best-fit overall judgment would allow low level two.

Answer C

The first similarity in the two different examples of guerrilla warfare is the approach to fighting they adopted. In both Vietnam and in Afghanistan the guerrilla forces made knew that the invading forces (the Americans and the Soviets) had a huge advantage in terms of sophisticated weapons and resources. So there was no way the war could be won in open warfare. Instead, in both countries tactics such as ambushes, booby traps and sabotage were

used. These tactics prevented the Americans and the Soviets from using their military superiority.

There was also a similarity in the way that the Vietcong and Mujaheddin guerrillas had support from the local communities. In Vietnam the Vietcong were able to hide in villages and pretend to be locals. The Americans became very frustrated because they couldn't tell who the enemy was and who were just innocent victims. It was the same in Afghanistan. The local tribesmen hated the Russian invaders and they were happy to hide Mujaheddin fighters or pretend that they were local tribesmen.

Examiner Comment

The answer clearly explains two similarities – in tactics and in working with the local population. The comparisons are supported.

The answer would be marked at Level 3 for both strands.

Section B Question (a)

Targets: AO1 (2 marks) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

AO2 (4 marks) Explain, analyse and make judgements about historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple comment is offered about similarity(ies)/ difference(s) [AO2] Generalised information about the topic is included, showing limited knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarities / differences are explained [AO2] Specific information about the topic is added to support the explanation [AO1] <p>Maximum 3 marks for an answer dealing with only one similarity/ difference.</p>
3	5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarities / differences are explained, making explicit comparisons [AO2] Specific information about both periods is added to support the comparison [AO1]

(b) Explain **TWO** causes of the 'War on Terror'. (8)

Answer A

The causes of the war on terror were actions carried out by terrorist groups. The Americans were very unhappy about these terrorist attacks.

Examiner Comment

The answer has identified a cause (actions by terrorist groups) but there is no explanation of why these actions led to war. There is almost no information to support the simple comment made.

The answer would be marked at the bottom of Level 1 for a simple comment about causation.

Answer B

The war on terror began after the attacks on New York in 2001 in which 2977 American civilians were killed. The Bush administration was convinced that al-Qaeda were responsible for these attacks and that they were based in Afghanistan. The Bush administration passed an act which allowed the US armed forces to find those responsible for 9/11 and to attack them.

Examiner Comment

The answer has failed to address the second order historical concept being tested in this question (causation). A narrative account of start of the war is given but, at best, the answer offers no more than a simple implied comment about causation.

The answer would be marked Level 1 for AO2 and for AO1. There is specific information, but it is not used to support an explanation and so cannot be credited in level two.

Answer C

There are a number of reasons for the war on terror being declared. The immediate reason was a reaction to the 9/11 attacks, but a more general reason was the belief in the United States that its way of life was under threat from terrorism.

In September 2001 there was a terrorist attack on New York in which the 'Twin Towers' were destroyed and nearly 3000 American civilians were killed. Retaliation for this was the main reason why the war on terror was launched. You can see that because the law allowing the Americans to use their armed forces against those responsible for the attack was passed just 3 days later. As the world's most powerful country, there was no way that the USA was going to allow an attack like 9/11 without hitting back.

Another reason why the war on terror was launched was that the USA had come to realise that there were organisations in the world, like al-Qaeda, who were determined to wage a terrorist war against the USA and what it believed in. They felt that the only way to counter this threat was to go on the attack and destroy the terrorist organisations wherever they were based. For example, the Bush administration believed that the Taliban in Afghanistan was in some way linked with al-Qaeda, so that is why American forces invaded Afghanistan in October 2001. They wanted to destroy the Taliban.

Examiner Comment

The answer provides a clear explanation of two causes of the war of terror (the American reaction to 9/11 and American fears). Specific information is provided to support those arguments.

The answer would be marked at Level 3 for explaining how the causes analysed led to the outcome (the war on terror) and providing accurate and relevant information to support the explanation.

Section B: Question (b)

Targets: AO1 (4 marks) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

AO2 (4 marks) Explain, analyse and make judgements about historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple comment is offered about cause(s). [AO2] Generalised information about the topic is included, showing limited knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Features of the period are analysed to explain causes. [AO2] Specific information about the topic is added to support the explanation. [AO1]
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Features of the period are analysed to explain causes and to show how they led to the outcome. [AO2] Accurate and relevant information is included to support the explanation, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]

(c) *How far did aerial warfare change in the years 1945–2011? (16)*

You may use the following in your answer:

- ‘surgical’ air strikes in the Middle East
- drone wars in Pakistan

You **must** also use information of your own.

Answer A

I think that aerial warfare changed a lot in this period. In 1945 the Allies were carrying out bombing raids that killed hundreds of thousands of civilians who had little or nothing to do with the war. But by 2011 they had given up using such crude methods of bombing.

Examiner Comment

The answer offers a generalised comment on change, limited knowledge and a judgement which is asserted, not supported.

The answer would be marked at Level 1 for all three strands

Answer B

In 1945 the Americans and British launched huge bombing raids to destroy industrial and military targets, but also on German cities to break the morale of the German people. In the war against Japan the Americans dropped atomic bombs to cause such devastation that the Japanese would surrender without the Allies having to invade. Aerial warfare wasn't like that by 2011. In the American bombing of Baghdad, the bombers focused on government buildings and military targets. In drone attacks on Pakistan, it was individual buildings where terrorist leaders were that were attacked.

Examiner Comment

The answer provides the accurate and relevant information needed to support an explanation of change. It also provides some limited analysis of change ‘wasn't like that by ...’. The judgment as to extent of change is missing.

The answer would be marked at low Level 1 for AO2 and level two for AO1. Given the weakness of the AO2 strands, the answer would be awarded top level one as a ‘best fit’ judgment.

Answer C

In some ways aerial warfare changed a great deal between 1945 and 2011, but in other ways it was really quite similar.

Aerial attacks in 1945 were more involved in carpet bombing because that way they could be sure to hit military and industrial targets even if it cost civilian lives. So huge raids were

carried out on German and Japanese cities. That seemed different from the more surgical strikes that took place when the war against Iraq started and Baghdad was bombed. But it wasn't that difference really. Both types of warfare involved establishing air supremacy and then trying to weaken the enemy by knocking out industrial and military bases. What was different was that attacks on Iraq, or drone attacks on Pakistan were more precise and cost far fewer civilian lives. But the aim of the warfare was the same.

We could say that drone attacks on Pakistan were a change in aerial warfare because the drones did not have pilots and this was something new. That is only partly true because during the Second World War the Germans launched V1 and V2 rockets on England from the Dutch North Sea coast. A difference is that the V1 and V2 rockets were just aimed at England and might land on any building, whereas the drones were much more precise, being aimed at individual buildings. However, even that isn't a clear difference because drones sometimes destroyed buildings that were not supposed to be the target.

In the end, we might say that aerial warfare did change, but not that extensively.

Examiner Comment

The answer provides a logical and sustained argument that whilst there were changes in the approach, there were clear similarities in the tactics and outcomes -change was, therefore, limited. The argument is supported with precise information

The answer would be marked at Level 4 for all three strands for a coherent and sustained line of reasoning, precisely-selected information and a well-supported judgement, the justification for which has been made clear.

Section B: Question (c)

Targets: AO1 (7 marks) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

AO2 (9 marks) Explain, analyse and make judgements about historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A simple or generalised answer is given, lacking development and organisation. [AO2]• Limited knowledge of the topic is shown. [AO1]• The overall judgement is missing or asserted. [AO2]
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An explanation is given, showing limited analysis and with implicit links to the conceptual focus of the question. It shows some development and organisation of material but a line of reasoning is not sustained. [AO2]• Accurate and relevant information is added, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]• The overall judgement is given but its justification is asserted or insecure. [AO2] <p>Maximum 6 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</p>
3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An explanation is given, showing some analysis that is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2]• Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]• The overall judgement is given with some justification, but some criteria selected for the required judgement are left implicit or not validly applied. [AO2] <p>Maximum 10 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</p>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An analytical explanation is given that is directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question, showing a line of reasoning that is coherent, sustained and logically structured. [AO2]• Accurate and relevant information is precisely selected to address the question directly, showing wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]• Criteria for the required judgement are justified and applied in the process of reaching the overall judgement. [AO2] <p>No access to Level 4 for answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</p>