How to write an extended abstract

I'm not robot

reCAPTCHA

Continue

Here's a suggestion of what an extended summary should include:Background - A little story about who did what and how your work fits. Goal - What you're trying to tell the audience that they don't know yet (e.g. your story). Method - Why the audience should believe that the results you have are not made out or flawedresults - evidence that you are using that they will confirm their story result- summary of your story and its implications - Why anyone might doubt their history and what you have done to get rid of as much doubt as possible. What if I present an overview of my progress so far and don't have an original research? Method = Literature survey. Results = what you have read. Note: It's really important that you have a story. A list of what you have read is not good. An analysis of what you have read is good because you can tell the audience something they don't know yet. An imperfect example of an extended summaryExample1Further ReadingKoopman (1997) How to Write an abstract William Pugh Dept. by Computer Science and Institute for Advanced Computer Studies Univ. of Maryland, College Park This article is from discussions in the Program Committee for SIGPLAN'91 PLDI. The programme committee considered it useful to compile some advice for authors. In order to give some context to these proposals, I have also provided a brief description of the process by which the conference papers were reviewed, partly from my point of view. This process is similar to the way most SIGPLAN conferences are run, although the details for each conference are different. How the papers were evaluated: 169 extended abstracts were submitted at the SIGPLAN '91 PLDI conference. At the request of the Chairman of the Programme Committee, the members of the Programme Committee (and their graduates) refrained from submitting any abstracts to the conference. This allowed us not to have to deal with direct conflicts of interest. Each program committee member was assigned 60 abstracts based on their subject areas. Since all abstracts were sent to all committee members, members could review all the abstracts they wanted as long as they checked at least the abstracts assigned to them. Program committee members were able to review the abstracts themselves or have others review them, although in most cases, program committee members reviewed at least briefly all the abstracts assigned to them, even if they had colleagues review some of them in detail for them. Only after the end of the semester in the middle of the I couldn't read abstracts and gave myself a week off from reading abstracts at Christmas. So I had about four weeks to read the abstracts, and I couldn't spend much more than 20 hours a week reading them (due to the limitations of both the available time and the amount of verification I could a day earlier I suffered burnout). Because I read more abstracts than I was assigned, there was an average of one hour per abstract. Reading a summary, I had to try to understand the work presented, its meaning, and possible problems with it. I spent at least 30-40 minutes on almost every abstract, sometimes I came back to an abstract several times. I spent more than four hours each with multiple abstracts. In one case this was because the summary looked interesting, but poorly written; in another case, because the summary dealt with a dense topic. In several cases, I spent several hours on a paper just because I had expertise or interest in the subject described by the newspaper. The programme committee met for two days to discuss the submitted abstracts and to select the abstracts to be accepted. A preliminary numerical ranking provided by the assessments received in the run-up to the meeting helped to structure our discussions. For each of the several passes, some contributions were removed from the audit, others were retained for further discussion and some were accepted. After all, we had a total of 28 adopted papers. What is an extended summary? An extended summary is not simply a long summary. An extended summary should include references, comparisons with related work, evidence of key phrases, and other details expected in a research paper, but not in a summary. An extended summary is a research paper whose ideas and meaning can be understood in less than an hour. Writing an extended summary can be more challenging than writing research. Some things that can be omitted from an extended summary: future work, details of evidence, or implementation that should seem plausible to reviewers, effects that are not relevant to the basic ideas of the abstract. Some of the questions that the committee is addressing: are there major technical shortcomings in the summary? In some rare cases, evaluators found serious technical deficiencies in a submission. Is the work a significant step forward from previous work in the region, by the same authors or others? The summary should give a clear description of the advantages of the new technique over previous techniques. The simple description of an interesting new way of doing something that could be done easily and efficiently with earlier techniques is not accepted in the abstract. The best abstracts gave a clear description of what their results, which could not be done before and why this is significant. Examples and measurements are great for this. A related problem is not the indication of relevant work in this area. Don't rely on the program committee to recognize that x isn't working in this area because you're considering a slightly different issue that renders x methods unusable. If you have up-to-date additional contributions to topics related to your submission (from or to conferences or magazines), be sure to discuss your submission's contribution about your other contributions. If the work includes a specific application, does it make a more general contribution? Some abstracts described interesting specialized applications. Much of the content of these abstracts included descriptions of the context of the work or the application of standard techniques in the new context. In some cases, it was unclear whether the resulting paper would be useful to people who are not interested in the author's specific application. If you submit an advanced summary with a specific application, make sure that the essential contributions of your work are not lost in the details of your application. Does the summary offer an interesting perspective on a problem or does it describe experiences that might be useful to others? Several committee members complained that although several authors had built up essential systems and tried several approaches to find out which worked and which did not, the authors only wrote abstracts on narrow technical results related to their systems. Relevant comments on practical experience in trying to apply new technologies can significantly increase the value of each paper. Is the abstract well represented and comprehensible? We did not reject abstracts because they were poorly presented. But all other things were the same, the program committee was more enthusiastic about abstracts, which were presented clearly and well. Is the abstract too long? There are many methods to try to fit 20 pages of material into the 10-page limit for advanced abstracts (reduction of margins, use of 9-point type to 10-point guide with double columns, etc.) They are all strongly discouraged. The page boundary is to encourage authors to write abstracts that can be absorbed quickly, not to store trees (although our demand for double-page copies of the abstracts was aimed at this). No abstracts were rejected for length reasons alone, but none of the accepted abstracts significantly violated the spirit of the 10-page limit; see this as a strong indication. Several program committee members said that after reading 10 pages of material, they felt free to stop reading at any time if they weren't really enthusiastic about the newspaper. Do not allow the page count limit to prevent you from providing numbers or examples that make the paper more comprehensible. The page count limit should be considered as an upper limit for the number of complete pages of the text, without numbers or examples. A Disagreed, saying that the page limit should be strictly adhered to, noting that if an image is worth 1000 words, an image is worth more than the 200 words it displaces. In exceptional cases, it may be appropriate to place additional material in an annex that goes beyond the length limit. This is only acceptable if the Abstract itself stands alone without the additional material. Given their time limits, their auditors are likely to ignore the appendix. Acceptable material for an annex could include background material for committee members who are not familiar with the details of the research area, as well as details of evidence and implementations omitted from the text of the summary. Does the summary address the obvious questions that research raises? For example, if an abstract claims to describe an efficient, practical algorithm for something, it should give empirical timings, asymptotic analyses, or both. If the techniques described require solving a problem that is NP-Complete or not ecidable in general, the summary should discuss the difficult solution to the problem. It may be that in practice the problems that arise in the author's application can be solved efficiently; But if the summary does not discuss it, the program committee does not know whether the author is even aware of the potential problem. The Committee on Programmes was sympathetic to not expecting data that should have been very difficult to collect. However, the committee was disappointed in several cases of abstracts that failed to report data that would have been easy to collect and answered obvious questions about work. Last comments for authors: An ideal submission should have fascinated a reviewer within the first 5 minutes of reading, excited within 15 minutes and satisfied within 45 minutes. If your summary does not passes any of these tests, it can be rejected, regardless of how good the research is. Committee members can spend more than 30-45 minutes on your summary, but you shouldn't rely on it. Before submitting a summary, give it to a colleague in the programming languages who is unfamiliar with the details of your research or research area, and ask him or her how much they can get out of it in less than an hour. Do not overlook the importance of the introduction, the numbers, examples and conclusions (and, if applicable, measurements) in an extended summary. Keep in mind that some program committee members, of DerNot, are not experts in your field of research and that if they pick up your contribution, they may have already reviewed 8 abstracts that day. Material that can take an expert near you 5 minutes to go through, some committee members may take 20 minutes or more. There are some types of research that are difficult to publish a conference simply because of the amount of time and effort that would be required for the program committee members to properly review the summary. If you are unable to prepare an extended summary of your work that can be digested and its meaning can be understood in an hour, it may not be possible to accept your paper, no matter how good the research described is. For some types of research (in particular research on new topics), impossible to meet this standard, no matter how well you write. This is a regretable flaw in the system, and we have no remedy, except to suggest that you send your paper to a magazine where more time can be taken to properly referee it. Please remember that we cannot pay as much attention to a submission as a diary submission would give, and we make mistakes. If you receive back comments that indicate that the Program Committee misunderstood your summary, you can use this information constructively. If the program committee misunderstood your work, other readers may also misunderstand it. This note has placed a lot of emphasis on the idea that an extended summary must be clearly written and easy to understand. Of course, whenever possible, this standard should also be applied to full-fledged papers. For more advice, read the excellent article by Mark Wegman, who inspired this report: What it's like to be a POPL arbitrator; or How to write an extended summary so that it is more accepted, SIGPLAN Notices, Volume 21, No. 5, May 1986, pages 91-95. 91-95.