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Lecture overview

- Conversational QA
- Insights and future directions
- Writing a good review
- Seminar logistics
Writing a good review
The publication pipeline

- Do new research 😊
- **Write** an article
- Include references to useful articles
- Communicate to publisher (conference/journal)
- Article is peer-**reviewed** (typically three)
- Article is accepted or rejected for publication
- If accepted, the references contribute to citation counts of respective papers
- Review process is critical to advancement of scientific community!!
Writing a good review: Dos and don’ts

- Write in a structured manner (review form)

- Summary: Unbiased
  - Problem/motivation
  - Method
  - Evaluation
  - Do not copy from abstract – paraphrase!
  - Not we... but “The authors ...”
  - Show understanding of article in our own words
Writing a good review: Dos and don’ts

- Positives and negatives
  - Concise
    - Reduce redundancy
      - Pinpoint to section, quote numbers from experiments
      - Illustrate with examples
    - Attention to detail
      - typos, grammar...
    - Passive, 3rd person, polite, impersonal tone
    - Some but not too many first persons
  - Constructive
Positives and negatives

- Focus areas
  - Motivation
  - Method
  - Evaluation
  - Related work?

- Stay objective (I hate templates!)

- Try to **position** paper properly: what is paper for?

- Look at the bigger picture: main advantages and disadvantages

---

Critical Thinking

---

very well-written
don't cite highly relevant paper
Positives and negatives

- Anecdotal examples, ablation experiments, error analysis, statistical significance, glossary/table of concepts and notation, clear notation, overview figure

- No nitpicking

- Do not find flaws in (or praise) future work!

- Do not point out too many grammar and spelling issues

- Clarity, presentation, reproducibility very important
  - But don’t harp on them (introduction is long-drawn, related work is boring, ...)

- Be diplomatic but take a stand
Seminar logistics
Overview

- 15 students in total
- Each student is assigned two full research papers on a specific topic
- Topic assignment will be communicated on 11 November 2020
- Everyone must write a short review on the papers assigned to them
- And make a presentation
Written review

- Use review form

- Stick within 50-sentence limit in total for both papers

- Summary: 3-4 sentence (problem setup, method, evaluation results)

- At least three positives (3 - 5)

- At least three negatives (3 - 5)

- Submit before 14:00 on day of presentation

- By email to me and Magdalena with review as attachment (not inline)

- Subject: Review for 2020-stqa
Oral presentation

- 20 minutes’ talk (you present paper details)
- 10 minutes’ QA (we ask clarifications + other questions on the paper; read paper carefully)
- Total 30 minutes per student
- 3-4 students each week

Spread over four weeks
- 24.11, 01.12, 08.12, 15.12
- Volunteers for 17.11 also welcome 😊
Oral presentation

- 20 minutes’ talk = 10 minutes per paper

- Structure for each paper (about 5-7 slides)
  - Motivation
  - Method
  - Evaluation
    - Setup: Benchmarks, metrics, baselines, ...
    - Results: Main results, interesting analysis
  - Summary

- Students are encouraged to attend each others’ presentations, but this is not mandatory
Final details

- We will assign papers and dates, students can swap as per mutual convenience
- All presentations via Zoom
- Consent form needed before exam
- Review and presentation graded separately, later aggregated
- Absolute grading (relative if necessary)
- Grades released and sent to exam office (approximately) on 16.12
- Have fun 😊