Exercise Sheet 0: Research & Publishing

Maximilian Marx, Markus Krötzsch

Academic Skills in Computer Science, 2019-04-09, Summer Term 2019

Please prepare exercise 0.4 for the exercise session on 2019-04-16.

Exercise 0.1. Assign the following concepts to where they are likely to occur during publication: at a conference, in a journal, both, or neither?

1. a fixed deadline for submission

2. a *rebuttal*: the opportunity to respond to the reviews before the final decision

3. a *revise & resubmit* decision

4. the opportunity to suggest reviewers during submission

5. unforeseen delays in the publication process

6. a decision to accept the paper as a poster or a short paper

7. a double-blind reviewing process

8. a single-blind reviewing process

Exercise 0.2. Under which circumstances would you consider the following activities to be research?

1. running the unit tests for Python 3.5

2. brewing coffee

3. reproducing the results of an already published paper

4. discovering a new proof for an established result

5. settling a conjecture from an earlier paper

6. implementing a previously published algorithm

Exercise 0.3. Find and install a TeX distribution for your operating system[1]. Download the LNCS (Lecture Notes in Computer Science) template[2], and, using a text editor[3] of your choice, make sure that you can compile the following LaTeX file into a PDF document:

```
\documentclass{llncs}

\begin{document}
\title{Example Title}
\author{Example author}
\institute{Example institute}

\maketitle
```

---

[1] c.f. https://www.latex-project.org/get/#tex-distributions

[2] https://www.springer.com/de/it-informatik/lncs/conference-proceedings-guidelines

[3] Alternatively, you can use the ShareLaTeX server provided by the ZIH: http://tex.zih.tu-dresden.de/

```
\begin{abstract}
    This is an example abstract.
\end{abstract}

This is an example paper.
\end{document}
```

Exercise 0.4. (Homework)

Read the introduction section of the following papers. What do the authors claim as their contributions? Assuming that the paper fulfills these claims, how would you rate relevance, originality, and significance of the contributions? Now read the reviews (see bottom of the page). How did the reviewers assess the paper with respect to these qualities?

1. http://www.semantic-web-journal.net/content/characterizing-web-things-interactions-existential-reasoning

2. http://www.semantic-web-journal.net/content/automated-ontology-driven-management-heterogeneous-devices-iot

3. http://www.semantic-web-journal.net/content/querying-knowledge-graphs-extended-property-paths