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The goal of this paper is to provide an overview of my research. The paper discusses existing literature, the goals to be achieved in my research, and presents the ABC architecture, which was developed by me.
Writing style

Why would someone be interested in your work?

It is YOUR task to make the reader interested!

Put yourself into the position of the reader
– Have a clear idea about your target audience
– What will your reader already know?

Explain your contribution in a few lines
– Elevator pitch
How to get the reader interested?

1. Include pictures of scarcely dressed students
2. Include many figures
3. Include some research questions
4. Reference the reviewer’s work
5. Include many equations
Include some research questions

• Triggers the reader to think first

• Forces the author to formulate the key contributions in a precise way

• Helps to explain the research approach and paper’s structure

• Allows meaningful conclusions
The goal of this paper is to investigate how SNMP is used in practice. In particular, the following questions will be investigated:

1. Is SNMP primarily used for monitoring, or is it also used for configuration purposes?

2. Is management primarily based on standardized, or on vendor-specific MIB objects?

3. Is security an issue in network management? In other words, is SNMPv3 being used in practice?
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Structure of paper

Abstract
- Contribution

1. Intro
- context of your work / motivation for research in this area (broad)
- what is the specific problem this paper focuses on
- research questions (3 to 6)
- approach / how will you answer these questions
- paper organization

2. Contents
X-1. Contents
X. Conclusions
X+1 References
New ideas on ABC

Context / motivation

Specific problem

Research questions

contribution

approach

structure

I. Introduction

II. Related work
V. Conclusions

General conclusion

Answer research question 1

Further work

Answer research question 2

Answer research question 3
Between intro and conclusions ...

Depends on the kind of paper:
– Measurement paper
– Design paper
– Survey paper
Measurement paper

Possible structure:

• Chapter 1: Introduction
• Chapter 2: Measurement tools
• Chapter 3: Measurement environment
• Chapter 4: Results
• Chapter 5: Discussion
  – relation to earlier work / literature
• Chapter 6: Conclusions
• References
Possible structure:

• Chapter 1: Introduction
• Chapter 2: Existing literature
• Chapter 3: New architecture
• Chapter 4: Implementation
• Chapter 5: Measurements
• Chapter 6: Conclusions
• References
Possible structure:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Requirements
- Chapter 3: Existing solutions
- Chapter 4: New architecture
- Chapter 5: Verification
- Chapter 6: Conclusions
- References

Possible requirements:
- High performance
- Scalable
- ...

- Demonstrate existing solutions do not satisfy the requirements
- Explain small fixes are impossible
  ➡ discussion of literature

Verify requirements are met:
- Qualitative
- Quantitative:
  ▶ Analytical model
  ▶ Simulation
  ▶ Prototype and measurements

Compare to existing solutions
Survey paper

Possible structure:

• Chapter 1: Introduction
• Chapter 2: Paper 1
• Chapter 3: Paper 2
• Chapter 4: Paper 3
• Chapter 5: Paper 4
• Chapter 6: Conclusions
• References

What is wrong?
Possible structure:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Literature search
- Chapter 3: Architecture / Taxonomy
- Chapter 4: Aspect 1
- Chapter 5: Aspect 2
- Chapter 6: Aspect 3
- Chapter 7: Conclusions
  - Lessons learned
- References

Explain how you found literature
- Web search (scholar, ...)
- Web of Science / Scopus
- Citations

Discuss literature:
- General approaches
- Approaches specific for our context

- What will we do the same
- What will we do different
Example: survey of Internet in planes

... Chapter 3: Architecture
- Communication within a plane
- Communication to ground stations
- Security
- Performance

Chapter 4: Communication within a plane

Chapter 5: Communication to ground stations

Chapter 6: Security
- 6.1: General security approaches
- 6.2: Specific security problems in planes
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Be consistent!

What is wrong?

REFERENCES


REFERENCES


REFERENCES


REFERENCES


References

• Be consistent!
  – Example: http://www.tvu.ac.uk/lrs/guides/harvard.html
  – Bibtex can be useful (Google Scholar)

• If possible, avoid referencing Internet-drafts

• Reference the sources, not derived work
  – RFC, and not a book by some author
  – RFC of latest standard, not a historic version

• Do not create obvious references
  – No need to reference http://www.ietf.org/
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Common mistakes

• Violation of IEEE Policy on Self Plagiarism:
  If authors have used their own previously published work(s) as a basis for a new submission, they are required to cite the previous work(s) and very briefly indicate how the new submission offers substantial novel contributions beyond those of the previously published work(s).
Common mistakes

- Paper does not follow the author's guidelines
- Text contains errors:
  - Ask English native speaker
  - Use MS-Word (Framemaker, ...): grammar & spelling check
- Figures are hardly readable:
  - Take care with PDF: press versus screen quality
  - Before submission, print paper on black & white paper
- Too much information is put into the paper
  - Less is more!
  - “I would have sent you less if I had had time”
    (Kurose, Pascal, Goethe, Cicero, ...)
  - "Not that the story need be long, but it will take a long while to make it short." Thoreau
Example
Performance comparison between two approaches
Example
Performance comparison between two approaches

Show variance / error margin
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Where to submit

• Workshops and Summer Schools
  – E2EMON, BDIM, BcN, FeBID, MUCS, ACNM, MACE, EVGM (Co-located with IM / NOMS / Manweek)
  – AIMS Student workshop
  – EUNICE Summer School

• Conference
  – IM / NOMS
  – Manweek: DSOM, MMNS, IPOM

• Journal
  – IEEE Communications Magazine: Series on N&S Management
  – IEEE Transactions on N&S Management
  – JNSM
  – International Journal of Network management
  – IEEE Network, ToN, JSAC, ...
Where to submit

- IFIP 6.6 / Emanics / Simpleweb RSS feed
  - http://www.simpleweb.org/cfp.rss

- IEEE CNOM list
  - http://cnom.lrg.ufsc.br/

- IEEE ComSoc list

- TCCC mailing list
  - tccc@cs.columbia.edu

- IFIP Lists
  - http://www.ifip.or.at/cal_even.htm

- IFIP TC6 list
  - http://ifip.informatik.uni-hamburg.de/ifip/tc/6/events
Acceptance rate conferences

source: http://www.cs.ucsb.edu/~almeroth/conf/stats/
Lists of conference publications / citations

Libra:
- Microsoft Research Asia
- Has similar list for Journals
- Has also author ranking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Citation / publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFOCOM</td>
<td>4062</td>
<td>54217</td>
<td>13,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSOM</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMNS</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globecom</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPOM</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APNOMS</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How much time does an experienced Transactions reviewer typically spend per paper?

a) 10 minutes  
b) 30 minutes  
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d) 6 hours  
e) 1.5 day  
f) 4 days
The reviewer
The experienced reviewer

• Reads abstract, intro and conclusions

• Scans references

• Has an initial idea about acceptance / rejection

• Reads the remaining chapters to find evidence
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The TPC meeting

Papers are ranked by the TPC chairs
- Submission systems have automatic facilities for this

Assume 200 papers have been submitted
- Top 10 is accepted without discussion
- Worst 90 are rejected without discussion
- 100 “grey” papers remain to be discussed
- 3 minutes per paper remains
The TPC meeting

How are papers discussed?

– TPC members from the same institute as the authors leave the room

– Discussion started by TPC member who reviewed the paper

– All TPC members can see all reviews
  • they scan reviews for consistency
  • they scan confidential comments to the TPC
  • they scan rebuttal
Assume:
- reviewer 1 and 2 say: accept after minor changes
- reviewer 3 says: reject

Rebuttal 1:
We would like to thank the first reviewer for doing this great review. His comments will surely allow us to further improve the paper. In particular we will include the references to the papers he has mentioned. Also we would like to thank the second reviewer for his useful comments; we will use these comments to correct the typo’s. Finally we would like to thank reviewer 3, but would also like to ask him for clarification. We do not really understand his comments with respect to figure 6, since we did not include such picture. Also his comments on section 2 are a bit unclear, since we did not propose an architecture.
The rebuttal - Example 2

Assume:

– reviewer 1 and 2 say: accept after minor changes
– reviewer 3 says: reject

Rebuttal 2:

We believe reviewer 3 made a serious mistake, and entered the comments for another paper instead of ours. For example, the review refers to figure 6, whereas our paper does not include a figure 6. Also the review refers to an architecture in section 2, whereas our paper does not discuss any architecture.
SUMMARY

• Put yourself in the position of the reader
• Realize reviewers have limited time
• Your introduction and conclusions are vital
• Clearly indicate the contribution of your paper
• Consider formulating research questions
• Be consistent / show you’ve invested time
QUESTIONS?