

# **Big Data Analytics CS690 (001), Fall 2018**

**University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

**Mandatory summary template**

**IMPORTANT: Write your name at the beginning of the manuscript containing your summary and answers. Submit the summary in the pdf format. Name the pdf file with your name and the content of the file (e.g., paper1\_mtaufer.pdf, paper2\_mtaufer.pdf). Submit the file in your github private repository. To this end, create a sub-folder/sub-directory with the name “summaries” and push your summary in the sub-folder/sub-directory.**

**PART 1**

**1.1** Critically read the assigned paper. Use the paper “How to Read a Paper” by S. Keshav to define an effective strategy to read and understand a paper effectively and quickly.

**1.2** Write the summary of the paper. To address this part of the assignment you have to follow the instructions below. First of all, carefully and critically read the paper. Use the 6 questions below to summarize the paper. Mark the part(s) of the text that helps you to answer the six questions. Match questions with answers and mark the related text with the question number. Answer the questions. Your answers to each of the questions/statements should be as comprehensive as possible; several sentences should be used for each question. The answers should result in your summary.

1. The **main purpose** of the paper is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?

(State as accurately as possible the authors’ purpose for writing the paper. What is the paper trying to accomplish? What is the paper central aim?)

2. The **key questions** the authors are addressing are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?

(Identify the key questions in the mind of the authors when they wrote the paper. What questions is the paper raising? What question is the paper addressing?)

3. The **method(s)** used to answer these key questions are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?

(Describe the general approach used and include details that assist in evaluating the quality of the results – sample size, etc. From what point of view is the paper looking at this approach?)

4. The **testing approach** used to prove the validity/effectiveness of the method(s) is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?

(Identify the facts, observations, and/or data the authors are using to support their method(s). Be quantitative. What approach is the papers using in assessing the validity/effectiveness of the proposed methodology? How does the testing support the authors’ claims? What are the authors taking for granted? )

5. The main **conclusions** in these papers are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?

(Identify the key conclusion the authors present in the papers. How did the authors reach this conclusion?Is there another way to interpret the information? )

6. If we take this line of reasoning seriously, the **implications** are \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?

(What consequences are likely to follow if people take the author’s reasoning seriously? Trace the implications and consequences that follow from your reasoning. Search for negative as well as positive implications. Consider all possible consequence. )

Summary format and submission (mandatory):

1. Your paper summary **CANNOT** be shorter than 1 page or longer than 3 pages.
2. You **MUST** use a font size of 11pt and your manuscript SHOULD have margins of 1 inch, top, bottom and sides.
3. Your summary rephrases concepts in the paper and **SHOULD NOT** copy the paper.
4. Submit an electronic version of your summary in pdf format in sakai.
5. Choose wisely the name of the file. DO NOT use the name paper.pdf. or summary.pdf. A good name should contain your family name and should indicate the content of the paper or type of assignment. Do not use spaces in the name.

**1.3** Complete the evaluating reasoning below

You are required to answer the questions below and come up with a final evaluation of the paper assessing whether: (a) the paper properly addresses the element of reasoning (Yes); (b) the paper does not properly address the element of reasoning (No); or (c) the element of reasoning is not addressed in the paper (NA). Students need to substantiate their answers.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Elements of reasoning | Yes | No | NA |
| 1 | **Purpose:** What is the purpose of the reasoner? Is the purpose stated clearly or clearly implied? Is it justifiable? |  |  |  |
| 2 | **Question:** Is the question at issue well stated? Is it clear and unbiased? Does the expression of the question do justice to the complexity of the matter at issue? Are the question and purpose directly relevant to each other? |  |  |  |
| 3 | **Information:** Does the writer cite relevant evidence, experiences, and/or information essential to the issue? Is the information accurate? Does the writer address the complexities of the issue? |  |  |  |
| 4 | **Concepts:** Does the writer clarify key concepts when necessary? Are the concepts used justifiably? |  |  |  |
| 5 | **Assumptions:** Does the writer show sensitivity to what he or she is taking for granted or assuming (insofar as those assumptions might reasonably be questioned)? Does the writer use questionable assumptions without addressing problems that might be inherent in those assumptions? |  |  |  |
| 6 | **Inferences:** Does the writer develop a line of reasoning explaining well how s/he is arriving at her or his main conclusions? |  |  |  |
| 7 | **Point of View:** Does the writer show sensitivity to alternative relevant points of view or lines of reasoning? Does s/he consider and respond to objections framed from other relevant points of view? |  |  |  |
| 8 | **Implications:** Does the writer show sensitivity to the implications and consequences of the position s/he is taking? |  |  |  |

Overall, is this a well-written paper? Briefly substantiate your answer.