

# Deliverable 1

---

## **Write one paragraph summary of the area where you do your current project.**

The current project is based on making a robot that plays football in the robotics competition RoboCup. The computer science areas used in the project will most likely be **machine intelligence**, **simulation** and **data analysis**. Machine intelligence will be used to control and organise the robots. Simulation will most likely be utilised for finding the best strategy/action for each player. And data analysis is for interpret and process the noisy information each robot player receives.

## **Find two suitable workshops and two suitable conferences where your current project work could be possibly published. The submission deadline for the conferences/workshops should be in this or next year. For each workshop/conference provide its full name, acronym, an URL to the home-page of the event and the submission deadline.**

The workshops and conferences has deadline early 2020, and the groups work is not done before later this year. I expect the below mentioned will be held again next year, so if I want to participate, it will be 2021, and the same events.

### **Workshops:**

- The ECAI 2020 Workshop on Robustness of AI Systems Against Adversarial Attacks
  - RAISA3
  - <https://codeslaw.com/conference/raisa3-the-ecai-2020-workshop-on-robustness-of-ai-systems-against-adversarial-attacks-1423186>
  - Deadline: 16/3-2020
- Security in Machine Learning and its Applications
  - SiMLA 2020
  - <https://codeslaw.com/conference/simla-2020-security-in-machine-learning-and-its-applications-1424094>
  - Deadline: 25/4-2020

### **Conferences:**

- International Conference on Electronics and Electrical Engineering Design
  - ICEEED 2020: 14
  - <https://waset.org/electronics-and-electrical-engineering-design-conference-in-june-2020-in-new-york>
  - Deadline: 13/2-2020
- International Conference on Computer Science, Machine Learning and Analytics
  - ICCSMLA 2020: 14

- <https://waset.org/computer-science-machine-learning-and-analytics-conference-in-june-2020-in-venice>
- Deadline: 13/2-2020

## Deliverable 2

---

Names of all students participating in the preparation: Alihan Øztürk, Jon T. Nilsson, Christopher P. Krejler, and Mathias Hindsgaul.

Feedback received in lecture:

- Title: good
- Abstract
  - First sentence great
  - Too much introduction
  - Only 1-2 lines introduction
  - Use we after first paragraph
  - Second paragraph: what we made
  - Last sentence should start: "We constructed"

Title: **Simulation Framework for Automated Storage- and Retrieval Systems**

Abstract:

*The logistic demands of automated warehouses increase, as online shopping is expected to increase in the coming years. We constructed a framework which supports the implementation and testing of Multi Agent Path-Finding algorithms, using centralized communication, which aids in improving automated storage and retrieval systems (ASRS). The framework, with minor tweaks allows for comparison between centralized and de-centralized ASRS including simulation and evaluation of Path-Finding algorithms in both system architectures.*

## Deliverable 3

---

### 1. Read the paper

### 2. Write a summary of the content of the paper (one paragraph)

The paper is primarily for students in Theoretical Computer Science on the topic of giving a talk with slides. This may be a job interview, conference, at the exam or other occasions. The paper talks about the structure of your talk, how to act and talk, and a lot of guidelines for all aspects of public speaking.

### 3. List five points mentioned in the paper where you think are your major weaknesses when giving a (slide) presentation and where you would like to improve in the future.

1. Emphasise the introduction more
2. Road-map should point out specifics and not be too general
3. Use repetition of important points
4. The overall structure of the presentation
5. Think more about the use of colours

# Deliverable 4

---

## 1. Write your answers on the questions in cases A, B, C and D covered during the lecture (see the lecture slides).

**Case A (Alyssa) What should Alyssa do?** Try to contact the conference and ask for advice. Could also try to ask her university for funding. Additionally, she could consider just listing Ben and letting him go in her name, but that would be rather unethical, since he has not done anything to deserve it.

**What should Ben have handled the situation?** Ben should have informed Alyssa about the policy beforehand. Also, if Ben wanted to be listed as a co-author, he should have made an effort to actually contribute to the paper. Ben should have confronted Alyssa about the co-authorship, if he actually felt that he contributed.

**Is it reasonable to have expected Alyssa to have behaved any differently** No. The fault lies with Ben here.

**Case B (Authorship Practices) Do you see any cases of irresponsible conduct?** If both of them have agreed to submit the paper as joint authors, then that is fine. It might be a problem that Anna has gotten her results from another University, however, since it was only written down as a draft, it should not be an issue. The main issue is probably related to the fact that Bob might have not contributed sufficiently, in order to be deserving of his PhD.

**If so, what would have been the appropriate responsible conduct?** From the text, it seems that Bob might have not contributed "enough" to be considered co-author. If this is the case, Bob should have refused to have his name on the paper as a co-author. Furthermore, since the results that Anna provided had nothing to do with Bob at all, he should not be co-author. Anna might have also acted irresponsible, since she willingly let Bob co-author, even when he might have not contributed.

**What actions should be taken in the present situation, if any?** Nothing can be done. Anna willingly let Bob join.

**Case C Publication Practices: If the experiments are part of a series, are Paula and her students justified in not publishing them together?** If they wanted to submit the experiments as single papers, they should have submitted each paper when they were done with that part of the experiments and then they could begin with the second part. The experiments should be submitted as one big journal.

**If they decided to publish a single paper, how should the listing of authors be handled?** Its hard to say. They should all be listed as co-authors; "Paula, Stud1 & Stud2". Order should not matter here, since all of them are listed as equals. It's unreasonable to assume that a "correct" order could be made here.

**If a single paper is published, how can they emphasize to the review committees and funding agencies their various roles and the importance of the paper?** Listing everyone as co-authors means that everyone has contributed to everything. Emphasizing their roles makes no sense, since they have decided to publish the paper as one group. Trying to do so, would surely end badly.

**Case D : Selection of Data How should the data from the two suspected runs be handled?**

They can't remove points, since that would be unethical. They should keep the data points, but should then argue why the points might be wrong. If possible, they should redo the experiment.

**Should the data be included in tests of statistical significance and why?** If they have included the data points in their results and have argued that they are wrong, then we see no issue in removing them when doing further statistical testing. As long as they explicitly state that those data points have been removed.

**What other sources of information, in addition to their faculty adviser, can Deborah and Kathleen use to help decide?** They could contact their publisher (ACM for instance) and ask for advice.

**2. Did your opinion on some of the ethical issues changed after you discussed the cases in the groups/classroom? Comment briefly on how if your answer to this question was positive.**

I did not know that you would/could add a person to your paper only with the purpose of that person presentation the paper at a conference.

**3. In the report write the names of all students participating at the group discussion.**

Mads Kristian Bau-Madsen, Mads Faber, Mikkel Kuntz, Niels Kristian Lyshoj Jensen, Jan Taasti Jensen and Rasmus Buchholdt.

## **Deliverable 5**

---

**1. Write your answers on the questions in cases A, B and C covered during the lecture (see the lecture slides).**

**Case A Do you see any cases of irresponsible conduct?** Never copy word-for-word unless you cite the source. He also list a manuscript that as "submitted for publication", even though at the time of submission of the thesis, the paper was not quite finished. It sounds like Mark didn't take the PhD too serious?

**If so, what would have been the appropriate responsible conduct?** He should either have cited the sources or written it himself using his own words. He should also not have listed the manuscript if it was not a valid source at the time of publication.

**What actions should be taken in present situation, if any?** He should not get his PhD since the 20-30 included plagiarism, which is unfortunate, since he will possibly lose his post-doc position.

**Case B Do you see any cases of irresponsible conduct?** Classic miscommunication. John has started selling the language to ComCom without informing the others, though he later informs Jim.

**If so, what would have been the appropriate responsible conduct?** John should have informed the others about how he had talked to ComCom about the language, and that ComCom is interested in commercializing the language and giving John a contract. The case does not mention any NDA so he should have been able to do this.

**What actions should be taken in the present situation, if any?** John should tell about ComCom. Two companies have offered a contracts for the language, so no contract has been signed yet. That means, they technically still can choose which of the two companies they want to work with. As far as we understand, the university just wants *some* contract with the industry, so which one should not matter. ComCom has however only promised a contract with John, so he should have a good talk with his colleagues.

**Case C: Does Ben have any way of receiving credit for his work?** He could try and contact Dr. Freeman and ask him to add Ben to the citations. Both the project and the article just involves the technique, which means Ben might be credited as the inventor. He maybe able to get credit for the technique if he released a paper specifically about the technique.

**Should he contract Dr. Freeman in an effort to have his work recognized?** Yes, definitely.

**Is Ben's advisor mistaken in encouraging his students to be so open about their work?** No. It is good to be open, since it benefits the field of since. However, it assumes that everyone has high moral and wont steal or miscredit. But maybe Ben should not have fully explained the technique to Dr. Freeman, and just said "wait for the paper".

### **3. In the report write the names of all students participating at the group discussion.**

Nicolaj Østerby, Mikkel Kuntz, Simon Mathiasen and Roufan Wu.

## **Deliverable 6**

---

### **1. Select and read one paper of your interest from the recommended reading of blocks 1 to 5. (The paper by Ian Parberry from block 3 cannot be selected.)**

I chose the *How to Have Your Abstract Rejected* from block 3. I hope this counts as a paper.

### **2. Write a one paragraph summary of the content of the paper.**

The paper is written as pure sarcasm to emphasise exactly what not to do when writing an abstract.

### **3. Why did you choose this paper and what was the most important thing that you can perhaps use in your future professional career?**

I chose it mostly because of the title. If the authors has chosen a title like that, it must be a good read.

What I found most useful is what I think they call: Run Spot Run. This is where your abstract contains text but is way too shallow and not in detail at all. A few lines of this way of writing can easily slip into your abstract - at least in the first draft and is for sure something too look out for.

#### **4. What topic(s) covered during the first part of the course did you find most interesting?**

Block 3: Presenting a Scientific Work, was the one I found most interesting. Throughout the lecture a lot of good and very useful points were made, that can be used in everyday life. How you present a topic is something I think that always can be improved, and the guest talk was a fun and educational!