TDDD50 Article Report

(Total length 3-4 pages)

Article: <Article title> [1]

(note that details of this ref [1] should be the first item in your bibliography)

Student Name:
Seminar Group: AI tools used: [ ]
Date:

- This is font size 12 (Times New Roman). – do not use any fonts smaller than size 11.
- Usage of AI is allowed for language improvement purposes but has to be declared by checking the box on the cover page.
- Send your report in **pdf format** with the proper file name:
  TDDD50_group_<seminar#>_<paper#>_<studentID>_ver#.pdf.
  For example: TDDD50_A_seminar2_paper4_ekhve37_ver1.pdf

1. Summary (300 - 450 words)

- Summarise in your own words the key ideas, methods, and conclusions of the paper as you understand them. Then add:
  - What evidence supports the key contributions of the paper?
  - How do the authors argue for the claims they put forward?

Note that this is not a review of the style of writing in the paper ("recension"), i.e., you are not supposed to say how it felt reading the paper, what you think about the article readability, whether it is easy to read or not, whether it is well written etc. It is about the **technical content** of the paper, but you can (and if relevant should) say that you did not understand some specific part of it.

2. Discussion (600 - 900 words)

The following are some guidelines to inspire and help you writing your discussion. Do not copy or follow directly this structure (the list). Instead, structure the discussion in your own way.

- Critical analysis of the article and the ideas it proposes
  - Weak and strong aspects of the article and **motivation** for your opinion
  - Applicability of the idea (hint: include your own reflection **relating to** the content/results of **other** articles discussed in the course or topics mentioned in the lecture material)
  - Claims/results with which you do not agree and the **reason** for it
  - Possible **extensions** or suggestions for improvement, e.g., alternative solutions to the problem or potential applications to another context.
- Think about the assumptions present (or implicit) in the paper
  - What assumptions does the author make?
  - Are the assumptions realistic?
  - Do the authors restrict the work to a particular application?
- Think about the methodology of the authors
  - Is the work evaluated qualitatively or quantitatively?
  - Does the methodology have any weaknesses? (e.g., the reasoning or in the performed experiments)
- Think about the type of evidence that is provided (empirical, statistical, logical, etc.)
- Are there any gaps in the evidence (or reasoning)? State your opinion based on facts and data. Avoid expressions such as "I felt" or "I dislike"
- Think about the conclusions of the paper

- Does the data adequately support the conclusion drawn by the researcher(s)? Are other interpretations possible?

Note that here you are expected to summarise your own assessment but **also expected** to reflect the **discussion in the group**, i.e. what you learnt after discussing it in the group can be included.

Writing quality indicators to observe**:**

- Structure your discussion so that **each paragraph** discusses a **single** idea or concept
- Introduce acronyms before using them, e.g., "… Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE) …"
- Avoid contractions, e.g., use "is not" instead of "isn't"
- Check grammar and spelling mistakes using a spell and grammar tool (e.g., Word indicates a lot of mistakes if you find the right setting)

3. Related work

Find and describe some works related to the assigned article:

- Scientific (published by a publisher, peer-reviewed) technical articles based on search guidelines are required. Instead of finding papers that appear on some repository (e.g. Arxiv, Researchgate, some university web page, google scholar listing and so on), find the original publisher page. Then you know that it is a peer-reviewed article. Include the permanent Document Identifier (DOI) in your reference.
- Works must deal with the same or similar problems compared to the main article
- Chosen related works must have been published **later** than the paper you presented
- **At least 2 articles** required
  - Summarise each article and explain how each article is related to the main article (e.g., different solution to the same problem, same approach to a different problem, improvements over first solution, etc.)
  - Use about 200 words per article
  - Articles discussed in the seminars or present in the references of the main article are not accepted in this section. Older articles than the one you read also typically do not add to the knowledge gained. Contact your teacher if you have problems.

Hint: check the "Information Search" section of the website for the course for help on selecting new references (also seminar 0). http://www.ida.liu.se/~TDDD50/report/information-search.en.shtml

When referring to other published papers in your report use the **best practices** outlined below:

- Refer to papers, including your own article, by mentioning the authors (e.g. "X and Y […] propose …" or when there are >2 authors, "X et al. study …") and then go on to describe the main insight from each paper that you read.
- Do not give the full title of the related article in your own text (only in your references).
- Do not use the authors' first names or initials in your running text.
- Avoid using expressions like "In [3] the authors did this" or "a new method for … is presented in [2]. Instead, name the authors so that your text is readable even when the ref is removed. For example: "Burguera et al. [1] present a framework for ..." and if there are two authors in a

paper both are mentioned: “X and Y [2] have proposed a technique…”.

4. Bibliography

It should contain any article referred in your report. The format of the references should be similar in all your references under the section. See the example format below. Make sure that every reference has a publisher, full name of conference (as well as the acronym for the conference) or journal (and its volume, issue number) and names of **all authors**.

[1] I. Burguera, U. Zurutuza, and S. Nadjm-Tehrani, Crowdroid: Behavior-Based Malware Detection System for Android, in proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Security and Privacy in Smartphones and Mobile Devices (SPSM), ACM, October 2011.