



give me essence of this paragraph:

Overall, we see that whatever you measure is bound to increase over time. For most of these competitions, the measurement was a useful one, and the state of the art has progressed. In the case of ICAPS, some planning researchers worry that too much attention has been lavished on the competition itself. In some cases, progress has left the competition behind, as in TREC, where the resources available to commercial search engines outpaced those available to academic researchers. In this case the TREC competition was useful—it helped train many of the people who ended up in commercial search engines—and in no way drew energy away from new ideas. In computer vision, as in planning, improved performance on competition benchmarks has become almost essential for a new idea to be published, which many argue is a serious obstacle to research and may lead to an entire field become stuck in a dead-end approach.



The paragraph discusses how measuring progress in competitions often leads to improvement, but there are concerns. In some fields, such as planning and computer vision, competition benchmarks dominate to the point that they may stifle innovation. While competitions like TREC have been useful, especially in training people for commercial roles, some worry that focusing too much on benchmarks can prevent the exploration of new ideas, potentially causing the field to stagnate.



Message ChatGPT

