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ABSTRACT

Write your abstract here. This should be a 250–500 word summary of what you did, why it’s important or interesting, and what your results looked like. Very briefly, what did you do, how did you do it, etc. Think of it as the elevator pitch for your paper. Convince me I should read the whole thing.

1 Introduction

Just like the introduction to any paper, set the stage here. What did you do? What was the overall problem you were trying to address? How did you address it? Tell me what you’re going to tell me. This should be longer and more detailed than your abstract.

2 Related Work

This is where your literature review goes. What have people done that is similar? Start constructing the argument for why your work is different from what others have done before. Don’t just give me a laundry list of other papers. Organize them thematically. These papers all did XYZ or a variation on it, but they neglect this or that. These other papers tried to address this and that, but only under these circumstances.

3 Model

Now we are in the meat of the paper. What did you build? Detail here is good. Go into the design, go into the decisions you made and why you made those decisions. Assume your audience is people familiar with CS, but maybe not with this particular area of it. You don’t need to explain every line of your code, but if you have particularly interesting or complex algorithms, going into detail is worthwhile. This should be a substantial chunk of your paper.

4 Methodology/Assessment

How did you evaluate whatever you just described? If you did multiple evaluations or multiple types of evaluations, break them down here. This section is for procedure, not for results. If you have lots of distinct assessments, then you could break this into many sections of procedure and results, procedure and results, etc. Like the section before, this is probably pretty extensive.

5 Results

Data data data. You just told me the procedure, now tell me what the results were of that procedure. Give me numbers, tables, graphs, whatever I need to make sense of what you learned.

6 Discussion

Interpret that data. What does it all mean? What have you learned and what have you shown from all of those assessments that you did? After sections 3 and 4, this is probably the next longest part of the paper.

7 Limitations

What are the “Yeah, buts” in your work? Yeah, but it only works on Tuesdays. Yeah, but we tested it under perfect laboratory circumstances and who knows if this will work out in the wild? Think back to the criticisms you had about papers in your lit review – what criticism might someone have about this work? Cut them off at the pass and admit your flaws!

8 Future Work

Where could you go from here, if you wanted to build on this work? What are the logical next steps? What assessments do you wish you did that you were not able to do? How would you address the limitations that you just discussed?

9 Conclusion

Wrap up your argument. What have you demonstrated about whatever it is that you’ve constructed and assessed. What do we know now that we didn’t know before?
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