Specification for CMPUT 603 Paper # 2

José Nelson Amaral
Department of Computing Science,
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

Paul Berube
Department of Computing Science,
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

1 Specification of Paper #2

The paper #1 of CMPUT 603 afforded the students experience with writing, typesetting, and reviewing papers. Paper #2 should focus on the student's intended area of research. Students are not expected to have new research results to discuss during their first semester in a graduate program. Thus, paper #2 will most likely be a review of pertinent literature. The best papers will clearly and concisely present a research problem, will then proceed to discuss the various ways in which this problem has been addressed in the past, and propose new approaches to the problem.

There are many possible variations in this model. For instance, a paper may discuss several related papers and then present a new research problem that was not identified in the early work. Or it may present and discuss published experimental results to point out flaws or shortcomings in the experimental setup, or to unearth questions that previous authors failed to ask.

Paper #2 should not be a simple regurgitation of published research results. The referees for paper #2 will expect to read the author's own analysis of the material discussed, as well as the author's own opinion on the direction that the research should take in the future.

The requirements for formatting, bibliography, and proper use of display material issued for paper #1 are in effect for paper #2.

1.1 The Title and the Abstract of Paper # 2

The title and the abstract of paper # 2 should be exclusively about the research problem discussed in the paper. They should not contain "CMPUT 603" on it, and nowhere in the paper the discussion should be cast as "an exercise on writing to 603." The author of paper # 2 should write it in the same way that she/he would have written a paper to submit to an actual workshop or conference.

1.2 Relationship Between Paper #1 and Paper #2

The presentation and analysis of a research problem, or of a field of research, shall require the critical reading of several papers. Some of these papers might be the same ones discussed in paper #1. However reviewers will be attentive to extensive cut and pasting from paper #1 into paper # 2 and shall duly penalize such practice in their evaluation of the work. As a rule of thumb, a minimum of 50% of the material presented in paper # 2 must be new. Material that migrates from paper #1 into paper # 2 must be revised and improved in light of the feedback received from the submission of paper #1.

For the purpose of writing paper #2, the author should assume that the submission of paper #1 resulted in rejection. Therefore there is no need to cite paper #1 in paper #2.