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Submitting Process
Submitting Process Overview

**Timeline**

- **Submission of Draft for Peer-Review:** July 27, 11:59 PM*
- **Peer-Review Submission:** August 10, 11:59 PM*
  - One anonymous review per student
- **Final Submission:** August 31, 11:59 PM*

**Format**

- Formatted using the [ACM SIG Proceedings Paper Format](https://www.acm.org/publications/authors/submissions)
- Scope of around six pages

* Email to [Johannes Huegle](mailto:johannes.huegle@hpi.de)
Introduction to Scientific Writing
1. Introduction
Aims of Research

- Extend knowledge of mankind
  - Identify a *problem* that has not been solved yet
  - Formulate the problem or a question
  - Solve the problem/answer the question

- Have an overview of *existing approaches*, literature, and related issues

- Organize your arguments and results to be
  - Short,
  - Profound, and
  - Expressive
1. Introduction
Types of Scientific Publications

- **Methodical paper**
  New algorithms, systems, etc.

- **Review / survey paper**
  Status quo / current status of a research area

- **Concepts paper**
  New ideas or theories without concrete realization

- **Evaluation paper**
  Quantitative comparison of different approaches

- **Technical Report**
  Notification of current status of an approach within organization, usually no review
1. Introduction
Writing Procedure

- Every paper *tells a story – know your story!*
  - **What:** What you want to find, the problem being solved
  - **Why:** Purpose and rationale
  - **How:** Your approach

- *Write for the reader, not for yourself!*

- *Plan your document structure*
  Create an outline, discuss with others

- *Write top-down*
  broad themes/ideas first, then go into detail
2. Paper Sections
Hourglass

- General Topic
- Specific Topic
- Specific Results
- Broader Discussion

- Title
- Abstract
- Introduction
- (Background)
- Related Work
- Main Part
- Conclusion
- References

See also: IMRAD structure (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/IMRAD)
2. Paper Sections

Abstract

- Usually not more than 140 words
- Reflects the main story of the research paper
- *Calls attention* – make the reader curious about the content!
- Short and concise sentences

- Always follows a *funnel structure*
  - **Scope** – What is the general context?
  - **Problem** – What is the specific problem?
  - **Significance** – Why is it a problem?
  - **Solution** – How do you solve it?
  - **Evaluation** – Does your solution fulfill expectations (very short)?
2. Paper Sections
Introduction

- Structure of abstract also applicable here, but in more detail

- First paragraph important: Reader decides here to continue reading!

- Particular tasks:
  - Introduce the topic and define the terminology
  - Indicate the focus of the paper and research objectives
  - Last paragraph outlines the structure of the paper

- Do not present your results here
2. Paper Sections
Related Work

- Purposes:
  - Help understanding the field and the problem
  - Show that you are aware of what is outside and appreciate the work of your colleagues
  - Compare and differentiate your work with the state of the art

- Content:
  - Strategies of the different approaches, strengths/weaknesses
  - How do we address potential shortcomings? (Contribution!)

- Useful instrument: Comparison table with your important criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Approach A</th>
<th>Approach B</th>
<th>Our Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Paper Sections
Hints for Literature Review

- Backward/forward search for publications in online archives
  - IEEE: http://www.computer.org
  - ACM: http://www.acm.org
  - Google Scholar: http://scholar.google.com
  - Microsoft Academic: https://academic.microsoft.com/
  - Citeseer: http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/
  - Uni Potsdam Library: http://info.ub.uni-potsdam.de/
2. Paper Sections

Main Part

- Conceptual part – Particular algorithm
- Implementation part – Architectural aspects of your prototype
- Results – What experiments did we run and what did we observe?
- Evaluation – What are the reasons for our observations?
- Discussion – What do these findings mean for our approach?
2. Paper Sections

Conclusion

- **NOT a summary**: Sum up your findings, not what you have done
- Answer research questions/objectives
- State the importance of discovery and future implications
- Strong statements should be made (avoid “it may be concluded...”)
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3. Further Recommendations

Figures

- Good figures can make a paper come alive
- Good figures communicate ideas or patterns in the data much better than big tables of numbers
- Choose reasonable captions
- Be aware of printing resolutions (300 dpi for colors, 600 dpi for b/w)
- Prefer shadings over colors – documents are usually printed in b/w mode

Be aware of color blindness
3. Further Recommendations

Tables

- Captions should not be too long, but also not "architecture of ..."

- Same with figures: Choose reasonable captions

- Explain content in more detail in the text

- If something is not worth explaining it in text → do not put it in the table
3. Further Recommendations

Footnotes

- NOT for parenthetical comments – important things must be in the text
- Footnotes should be used for things the typical reader can genuinely skip
- Websites etc. also do not belong into footnotes, list them as reference
- Footnotes stop readers, so better try to avoid
3. Further Recommendations

Citing

- Direct speech
  - “With method ... we achieve ...”
  - X claims he “… has developed a methodology ...”

- Indirect speech – rather name system instead of authors
  - X has developed a method ...

- Reference is not a subject of sentence – list it at the end of sentence
  - X has developed a method ... [1].
4. Argumentation Style
Proper Argumentation - What is an Argument?

An *argument* is a series of statements in which one or more statements (premises) are intended to support a statement (conclusion).

(1) 1st premise  (1) All cats are mammals.
(2) 2nd premise   (2) All tigers are cats
...                   ...
(n) n-th premise   (n) Tigers are mammals.
(c) Conclusion

This is just the standard form! You could also begin with the conclusion.
4. Argumentation Style
Deductive Arguments – Logical Validity

In an argument, the conclusion follows from the premises, if the conclusion has to be true in case the premises are true (were true).

**Deductive Argument:** An argument is called *valid*, if its conclusion follows *logically* from the premises.

You do not need any background information to check that!

In other words: If the reader agrees on the premises, he MUST also agree on the conclusion.

| (1) All cats are mammals. | (1) Unicorns like ice cream. |
| (2) Tigers are cats.     | (2) I like ice cream.       |
| (c) Tigers are mammals.  | (c) I am a unicorn.         |
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4. Argumentation Style
Deductive Arguments – Soundness

An argument is called **sound**, if
a) it is valid, and
b) its premises are true.

(1) All cats are mammals.
(2) Tigers are cats.
(c) Tigers are mammals.

**Sound**

(1) Unicorns like ice cream.
(2) I like ice cream.
(c) I am a unicorn.

**Logically Invalid**

(1) All dogs are chairs.
(2) Richard is a dog.
(c) Richard is a chair.

**False Premise**
4. Argumentation Style
Deductive Arguments – Examples

Always check your deductive arguments for two aspects:

1. Does the conclusion follow from the premises? (=LOGIC)
2. Are the premises true? (=TRUTH)

**Example 1:** Paris is the capital of France. That is why Europe should not admit more refugees.

**Example 2:** All refugees are terrorists, and Europe should not admit terrorists. That is why Europe should not admit more refugees.

**Example 3:** The NPD is an anti-semitic party. Anti-semitic parties should be banned. Therefore, the NPD should be banned.
4. Argumentation Style
Inductive Arguments

**Inductive Argument:** An argument that is intended to be *strong* or *forceful* rather than valid.

(1) According to source S it is the case that X.

(c) X.

S = Observation
   Study
   Expert
   Experience
   ...

*Example 1:* Literature shows that ... [3-10]

The acceptance of this argument depends on the reliability/credibility of the source!
4. Argumentation Style
Argumentation Structure Types

(a) Standard Argument

(b) Parallel Argument

(c) Mixed Argument

(d) Nested Argument
4. Argumentation Style
Recommendations for Written Argumentation

- Make deductive arguments valid
- Do not mix arguments
- State your conclusion explicitly
- Define important concepts
- Do not use synonyms
5. Accessible Writing Style
Overview

- Make reading the easiest for the reader
  - Write in an accessible style (no complicated sentence constructs)
  - No one can read your mind – provide enough context

- Reading pages of dense text is no fun
  - Make room for white spaces
  - Make content structure visible at first sight
  - Do not overload with 40 graphs – provide the key facts and points
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5. Accessible Writing Style

Main Rules for Accessible Writing

- Use verbs that are concrete
- Have simple things as grammatical subjects in your sentences
- Avoid clutter
- Active = Life, Passive = Death!
- Make your paragraph coherent
5. Accessible Writing Style
Informative Verbs

- Put activity and information into your verb

The data offer confirmation of the view that substance xy causes the destruction of neurons.

→ The data confirm the view that substance xy destroys neurons.

The obtained trend was positive and significant; depicting that over the years there has been certain increase in the night time surface ozone concentration over the study region.

→ The obtained trend was positive and significant. It shows that over the years the night time surface ozone concentration increased over the study region.
5. Accessible Writing Style
Little Red Riding Hood Principle

Once upon a time, as a walk in the woods was taking place on the part of Little-red-riding-hood, a jump from behind a tree by the wolf occurred, causing a fright reaction.

Long and complicated subjects

Once upon a time, as Little-red-riding-hood was walking in the woods, the wolf jumped out from behind a tree and frightened her.

Source:
https://vignette.wikia.nocookie.net/grimm Bilder/images/b/be/Rotkäppchen_Fritz_Baumgarten_02.jpg/revision/latest?cb=20121217072906&path-prefix=de
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5. Accessible Writing Style
Avoid Clutter

- Unnecessary meta-language

Another important aspect of the topic of sleep which should definitely be stressed at this point is that sleep deprivation impairs concentration.

→ Sleep deprivation impairs concentration.

- Unnecessary adjectives or adverbs

At the moment, there is a huge gap in the existing literature on autonomous driving regarding the politics and policy dynamics behind autonomous driving.

- Little qualifiers ("kind of", "a bit", "somehow" etc.)
5. Accessible Writing Style
Coherent Paragraphs

- Repeat main concept in a number of sentences

(1) **Whales** feed on **plankton**.
(2) **Plankton** is a source of nutrients for **whales**.

Start your sentence with known concepts and end with new insights.
5. Accessible Writing Style
Further Recommendations I/IV

- Keep sentences short and precise (German problem...)
- Use present tense – do not switch tenses
- First sentence of a paragraph = lead sentence!
- Do not use abbreviations in headlines
- Avoid (self) assessments - groundbreaking, good,...
- Avoid vague statements - possibly/probably, could/would/should,...
5. Accessible Writing Style
Further Recommendations II/IV

- Be aware of the difference between **such as** and **like**
  - **like** applies for closed bodies, i.e. you list all existing examples
  - **such as** applies for open d., i.e. there still exist other examples
  
  "Ice cream like vanilla" vs. "Ice cream, such as vanilla"

- Check **correct reference** of your verbs if you have multiple objects
  
  "This results in incomplete patient records which eventually …"

- Check your formulations for **correct meaningfulness** and reference
  
  "a method called HMW question" vs. "a method called formulation of HMW question"

- Use **uniform phrasing** in listings
  
  "I like eating and to run" vs. "I like eating and running"
5. Accessible Writing Style
Further Recommendations III/IV

- Do not describe circumstances - “after eight hours we realized ...”

- This and that: Avoid references to previous sentences by using them

- That and which: If you can put a comma before it, use which

- Choose the way of your parenthesis according to importance
  - Important: Comma
  - Good to know: Hyphen
  - Actually not important at all: Braces (avoid these! ;)

Causal Inference
- Theory and Applications
Uflacker, Huegle, Schmidt
Slide 35
5. Accessible Writing Style
Further Recommendations IV/IV

- Absolute statements: Always relate to units
- Consistency throughout the text - spelling, formatting, etc.
- Think about what to highlight: no exclamation marks, use italic
- Do not continuously refer to earlier or later pages
- Add paragraphs between section headline and first subsection
And Finally...
Before Submitting Any Paper

- Are headlines uniformly formatted, e.g. capitalized?
- Are proper tenses and voices used?
- Are all equations mathematically correct and explained in the text?
- Are all abbreviations explained/introduced?
- Are all figures/tables relevant and of good quality?
- Are all figures, tables, and equations listed and mentioned in the text?
- Are all references relevant, up to date and accessible?
- Are the references structured in a uniform format?
References
Useful Links and Books

- Ad Lagendijk: Survival Guide for Scientists: Writing - Presentation – Email
- Academic Phrasebank: [http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/](http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/)
- The Purdue Online Writing Lab - [http://owl.english.purdue.edu/](http://owl.english.purdue.edu/)
- ftp://fast.cs.utah.edu/pub/writing-papers.ps
- [http://www-net.cs.umass.edu/kurose/talks/top_10_tips_for_writing_a_paper.ppt](http://www-net.cs.umass.edu/kurose/talks/top_10_tips_for_writing_a_paper.ppt)
Reviewing a Paper – In Short
Goals

- Uphold the *quality and validity* of individual articles and the journals that publish them
- Scientific writing is a (never-ending) *learning process*

History

- The introduction of peer reviews set the cornerstone of modern science
- *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* is thought to be the first journal to formalize the peer review process 300 years ago
Reviewing a Paper – In Short
The Review System in Brief

What people think it looks like

What it really looks like
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Reviewing a Paper – In Short
The Review Process

Example from www.elsevier.com/reviewers/what-is-peer-review
Types of Review

Single blind review
- Reviewers’ names and affiliation hidden from the author
- Reviewer anonymity allows for impartial decisions
- Concerned that reviewers in their field could delay publication
- Reviewers may use their anonymity as justification for being unnecessarily critical

Double-blind review
- Both the reviewer and the author are anonymous (most common)
- Author anonymity prevents any reviewer bias
- Articles are considered on the basis of the content of their papers, rather than the reputation of their authors

Open review
- Reviewer and author are known to each other
- Discussions: Less honest or most honest review process?
1. **Read the article**

2. **Write a brief summary of the article and its contribution**

3. **Write out your major criticisms of the article**
   - Is the article well-organized?
   - Does the article contain all of the components you would expect?
   - Are the sections well-developed?
   - Does the author do a good job of synthesizing the literature?
   - Does the author answer the questions he/she sets out to answer?
   - Is the methodology clearly explained?
   - Does the theory connect to the data?
   - Is the article well-written and easy to understand?
   - Are you convinced by the author’s results? Why or why not?

4. **Write out any minor criticisms of the article**

5. **Review your review**
Reviewing a Paper – In Short
References and Useful Links

- Cawley, V. (2011). *Is peer review unethical?* International Conference on Social Science and Humanity
- Lee et al. (2013). *Bias in peer review*. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology