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Student Conference Course

- The course teaches writing a scientific paper (!) for a conference
- Coverage of
  - Topic selection
  - Literature research
  - Scientific writing
  - Submission (here via EasyChair conference system)
  - Peer reviewing
    (1) You give and receive comments from your peers
    (2) Final paper reviewed by a program committee
  - Conference presentation and publication
- Papers and presentations in English
Course Organization

**Deliverables, etc.**
- Topic selection
- Outline & annot. bibliography
- Full paper
- Final paper
- Conference

**Lectures**
- Course intro
- Scientific writing

**Supervision**
- Individual supervision
- Peer review groups
- Writing lab

**Notification**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Sep 4</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>MA478</td>
<td><strong>Lecture:</strong> Organizational details; Course overview and deadlines;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Sep 11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 1 due (topic selection).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Sep 18</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>MA406</td>
<td><strong>Lecture:</strong> Finding literature; Presenting scientific research—an introduction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Oct 2</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td><strong>First Peer Review Group Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Oct 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 2 due (outline plus annotated bibliography).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Oct 30</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td><strong>Second Peer Review Group Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Nov 20</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td><strong>Third Peer Review Group Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Dec 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 3 due (full paper).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Dec 18</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>MA478</td>
<td><strong>Lecture:</strong> Notification of preliminary acceptance. Discussion of results and feedback. Requirements for final paper and presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, Jan 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Deliverable 4 due (final revised paper).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue, Jan 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Notification of final acceptance.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, Jan 15</td>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>MC323SEM</td>
<td><strong>THE CONFERENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Notification After Deliverable 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Not accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Submit final paper</td>
<td>• Resubmit revised full paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appear in proceedings</td>
<td>• No publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present at conference</td>
<td>• Presentation later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Best grade 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading

- Quality of the full paper
- Quality of the presentation
- Quality of deliverable 2 (outline + annot. bibl.)
- Handling of required changes
- Participation in group meetings (obligatory)
Expected Results

- Ability to formulate a research question
- Ability to identify relevant scientific literature
- Develop a scientific attitude
- Experience of the peer review system
- Ability to give constructive feedback to the work of others
- Ability to write a scientific report in English
- Development of presentation and oral presentation in English
The Topic Selection (1)

- Choose any area in computer science (or I&D for TFE students) that you are familiar with
- Formulate a **NEW**, clear and specific research question or hypothesis
- Questions to ask yourself:
  - Are sufficient resources available?
  - Do I have the “background” required to write something **non-trivial**?
  - Does it seem possible within the time frame?
  - What is the new contribution?
The Topic Selection (2)

- Deliver a short document (about half a page)
  - Title
  - Brief description of the area
  - Brief description of your background in this area
  - Reason why you selected the area (forget "I want to learn something about X")
  - Brief description of your research question or hypothesis
  - Brief description of what is new
  - A few references you expect to be relevant

- No specific formatting guidelines (Latex is mandatory for the remaining writing)
The Topic Selection (3)

- All topics require approval by us
  - to exclude too difficult, exotic, or odd topics
  - to make sure that you have the required background to write a non-trivial paper
  - to check whether you have a chance to succeed
- We might help out with suitable topics in case you have difficulties finding a topic on your own
- Topics can be changed after approval by us
Peer Review Groups

- **Peer Review Groups**
  - One group for each research area
  - 3–4 students in each group (acting as both authors and reviewers) + supervisor

- **3 Peer Review Group Meetings** *(obligatory)*
  - Support you in writing your paper
  - Receive feedback on your ongoing work
  - Give feedback on others’ ongoing work
  - Discuss problems and ideas with your peers
Structure of a Peer Review Meeting

- **Preparation**
  - Distribute your work-in-progress at latest 2 days before the meeting
  - Read your peers' work-in-progress and make notes

- **Review of each participant’s work** (~20 min.)
  1. Author presents the work in current state
  2. Questions for clarification
  3. Author leaves the room
  4. Criticism, comments, and suggestions
  5. Author enters room and moderator summarizes
  6. Discussion continues
Guidelines for Peer Review Meetings

- The meetings are confidential and should not be discussed outside the group
- Constructive feedback
  - Motivate your positive or negative opinions
- Focus on “the big picture”, not on spelling mistakes!
- Can you as a reader understand and learn anything?
- Your supervisor acts as the moderator of the meeting and makes sure that the rules are obeyed
The Conference Peer Reviewing

1. Authors submit manuscripts (deliverable 3)
2. Editors or program committee chairs assign the manuscripts to established scientists for review
3. The experts
   - independently evaluate the manuscripts,
   - write reviews (aka referee reports), and
   - provide a recommendation
4. Editor / program committee evaluates the reviews and makes a final decision
5. The author (sometimes) gets a second chance (deliverable 4)
Available Resources

- Course webpage
- Course textbook
- Peers
- Supervisors
- Physical/virtual libraries
- Example documents

- Springer’s submission guidelines
- EasyChair conference system
- Templates
- Writing Lab (språkverkstan)

See course homepage for details
Help from Your Supervisor

- Talk to us during the peer review group meetings
- Make an appointment if you need additional advice
- Use your and your supervisor’s time efficiently
  - Prepare specific questions
  - Bring along a current version of your paper
  - Take notes and reflect on input
- Conducting the actual research is your task, not the supervisor’s
What to do now!

- Start thinking about your topic selection
  - Deadline for deliverable 1 is Sep. 11
- Get an EasyChair account
  - Your deliverables 2, 3, and 4 have to be submitted via
    https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=usccsf13

GOOD LUCK AND HAVE FUN!!