

Specialist English: Assignment 9

Rebecca J. Stones
rebecca.stones82@njb1.nankai.edu.cn

Date due: 26 December 2018

In this ninth assignment (worth 5% of the final mark), we will look at the Conclusions section (or Concluding Remarks) and the references.

My marking will be affected by (a) your English writing, (b) your LaTeX typesetting, (c) your mathematical presentation, and (d) your understanding of the underlying computer science. Basically, I will “peer review” your assignments. (No mark scaling this time.)

Problem 1 In the following two Conclusion sections, Zhu et al. (2017) and Liu et al. (2010), describe how the authors go beyond merely summarizing the paper in their Conclusion (if at all). [3 marks]

8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a novel transcoding system, C2, with a hybrid architecture which combines the computing power of cloud and crowd together to accomplish transcoding tasks in the emerging crowdsourced livecast systems. Facing the heterogeneity of viewers and the asymmetric information situation, we designed truthful auction mechanisms to select stable viewers for transcoding and tailor redundancy strategies for different types of workloads. We further proved theoretically that our proposed mechanism achieves social efficiency, individual rationality, and ex-post incentive compatibility. The trace-driven simulation demonstrated that our system achieves higher social welfare and lower service cost than the pure cloud solution.

— Zhu et al., *When Cloud Meets Uncertain Crowd: ...*, MM, 2017.

8. CONCLUSION

We have introduced an image retagging scheme that aims at improving the quality of the tags associated with social images in terms of content relevance. The scheme consists of three components, i.e., tag filtering, tag refinement and further enrichment. Experiments on real-world social image dataset have demonstrated its effectiveness. We have also shown two applications that benefit from the retagging scheme. Although we have put more emphasis on Flickr in this work, the proposed retagging framework is flexible and can be easily extended to deal with a variety of online media repositories, such as Zoomr as well as any other media databases with noisy and incomplete tags.

— Liu et al., *Image Retagging*, MM, 2010.

Problem 2 Critique the following Conclusions section. I.e., describe the pros and cons: identify what the authors have done well, and describe how it might be improved.

[4 marks]

(Answers to this question will vary based on your opinions; I'm seeking reasonably justified answers, rather than a "correct" answer.)

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have presented a novel approach to support stereoscopic 3D Web by extending existing HTML, CSS and JavaScript languages. We discussed the underlying principles of stereoscopic 3D and how these principles can be applied to the Web. We also extended current web languages for the stereoscopic 3D web. With HTML-S3D, CSS-S3D and JavaScript-S3D, users are able to add stereoscopic depth to an element easily.

There are still several issues remaining to be done. First, some parameters such as e and p , play an important role in the stereoscopic view. Appropriate values (or value ranges) should be studied to achieve more desirable visual effects. Second, although using properties in CSS-S3D we can easily turn an element into a stereoscopic one, the front-to-back rendering order of this element won't be changed so it doesn't interact with other elements. Take Figure 5 for example, the middle image will be painted behind the image on the left side if it doesn't have a bigger "z-Index", although it has a smaller "depth" property (closer to the viewer). Moreover, as we can see from Equation 5 and 6, an element's painting position is relevant to its (X, Y, Z) position in the 3D coordinate system and the viewer's observing angle, which we don't all take into account when dealing with the "depth" property. The web page authors may want to create a stereoscopic 3D rendering context, in which all the elements share the same global 3D rendering parameters and are all ranged in the same 3D scene. Third, all the perceived stereoscopic elements are parallel to the screen plane. It still needs a further investigation about how to apply 3D transforms to the stereoscopic view.

— Chen et al., *An Approach to Support Stereoscopic 3D Web*, SAC, 2014.

Problem 3 What is the difference between writing "NDNCERT aims to simplify ..." (as in the following snippet) and writing "NDNCERT simplifies ..."? So why is writing "NDNCERT aims to simplify ..." problematic?

[1 mark]

NDNCERT aims to simplify the work of NDN users and application developers by making trust management flexible, easy, and user-friendly. As the next step, we plan to integrate the client and components of the NDNCERT into NDN Control Center [3] and

— Zhang et al., *NDNCERT: Universal Usable Trust Management for NDN*, ICN, 2017.

Problem 4 The following snippet is a typical English disaster. Aside from "the future work" and "try other method" being grammatically wrong (and "depict the subspace" is also wrong since there's more than one subspace), I dislike the use of future tense and claiming ownership of the problem ("we will try"). Rewrite the following snippet to fix these problems. [2 marks]

In the future work, we will try other method to depict the subspace and construct more powerful mid-level features.

— Lu and Zhang, *Image Classification by Combining ...*, ICIAI, 2018.

Please "rewrite" the snippet; don't just "fix" it. I suggest looking at well-written Conclusion sections in computer-science papers to get an idea for how to reasonably phrase this.