

COMP90044: Guidance for Task 2, Assessment A

Academic Integrity

You should use absolutely no text that has been produced by another person or submitted previously for other assessments.

For PhD and MPhil students, the reuse of personally created text that has been used for progression check-points such as confirmation is fine. However, do not directly reuse text that has been published.

Any discovery of the reuse of other people's text will have serious repercussions. The Subject LMS pages have a link to the academic integrity training provided by the University. **THERE ARE NO EXCUSES OR EXCEPTIONS IN CASE OF ANY DISCOVERED REUSE.** They will be treated with the greatest firmness, and may lead to serious disciplinary steps.

Formatting

There are no particular formatting requirements except the following:

1. *Full and proper academic referencing must be used.* The specific format (Harvard, ACM, etc.) is not important. Missing or incomplete references will not be tolerated. If in doubt, the Harvard format is recommended, and guidance on this format is available through the library. Full references will include author, title, publication venue (journal, conference title), date, page numbers, and other items such as ISBN, issue number etc. as appropriate.
2. *Title, Student Name, email and Number.* The top of the first page must include your subject title, your name and your student email and student number.
3. *Introduction and Conclusion.* No fixed sections are required, but an introduction and conclusion. Add further sections to separate your document as makes sense for the structure of flow you use in the submission.
4. *Grammar.* Excellent grammar is expected throughout. Weak and incomplete grammar will result in lower marks. Incomprehensible text will be discounted from the marking.
5. *Presentation.* Avoid very long paragraphs and sentences. A paragraph should make a single coherent point clearly. Sentences should likewise do the same in more detail. If a sentence is over 15 words, it very definitely should be divided into (at least) two.
6. *Length.* The 1500 word limit is strict. References and titles are not included.
7. *File Format.* Please upload your document in PDF format.

Argument (Structure)

Carefully read the guidance from the course texts and the lectures.

Using References: While you can use a larger number of references, the best submissions emphasise 3-5 main works, and then use any further references to reinforce the key points. If two papers make similar arguments, describe one in detail then explain the similarity of the second. It is wasteful to repeat material. If saying ideas are similar, provide evidence (e.g. quotation or formula) to underpin this.

Do not simply repeat what is in the original papers. This runs at the risk of academic mispractice (see above). Furthermore, it does not show *your* understanding of the paper(s) and your ability to describe their ideas in your own terms. Highlight similarities and differences, and through that indicate the most important ideas.

Review Papers that summarise a field can be useful. If there is a recent good review paper related to your topic (e.g. one from the ACM Surveys for CS students) it is wise to use it as a starting point. However, make sure you also report at least two recent works in detail, even if used in the review paper.

Junk Publications: avoid publications from open-access locations such as ArXiv, university repositories or other easy-to-get venues of no importance. Check that the paper is from a proper conference or journal. Check the paper on Google Scholar – the more references it has received, the more useful it is. The university library is very likely to provide access without charge. Search for the paper title in the library catalogue.

Also avoid popular press and magazines in general. One article may be useful to highlight a point, but journalism is not research.

Use headings to clarify and structure your submission. With 1500 words, a good balance would be:

1. Introduction (150 words),
2. Explanation of the structure of the report (100 words),
3. Three-four main paper reviews (900 words total) – one heading each
4. Additional works (250 words) – a further heading
5. Conclusion (100 words)

Subheadings can also be useful (at least when writing) to remind you to cover each major point you want to make about a paper.

Report Evaluation Methods and Future Work

Don't just report what a paper's big idea is. For key papers, how did they *test* the idea (e.g. find a section called 'Method' or 'Evaluation')? Also, do they report any limitations or problems? This, any idea pointers towards *future work* may give you good ideas of simple next-steps to explore!