



# Research Methodology Contribution and Result

Lecture, 21. September 2007



# Structure of Paper

- Title: “Catchy summary of paper content”
- Abstract: “Why should you read our paper”
- Introduction: “What we will tell you”
- **Contribution (Main Part): “What we did”**
  - Hypothesis, method, evaluation, results
- Related Work: “The context and why new”
- Conclusion: “What we told you”
  - Sometimes also: Discussion, future work
- References: “Where to find context, etc”



# Purpose of Main Part

- Describe your contribution (duh!)
- But, wait, there is more:
  - Background information
  - Describing underpinnings of contribution
  - Describing contribution (finally!)
  - Evaluating contribution
  - Convincing reader contribution is good



# Background information

- Primary purpose
  - Define problem in question
  - Identify focus of your work
  - Identify objective of your work
- Depth and level depends on audience
  - General audience requires more
  - Expert audience requires less



# Underpinnings

- Hypothesis to be examined
  - “Expect algorithms using recursion to do better on small problems”
- Formalism and definitions
  - Material needed to understand contribution
  - Use, when possible, standard definitions
- Insights
  - What is behind your contribution



# Organization of main section

- Technical background
- Development of contribution
  - Usually in sections
  - Clear indication of contribution
  - Anticipatory answers to questions
- Supporting data and results



# Anticipating questions

- Made-up paragraph
  - If all elements in array  $A$  are unique, then the foobarsort takes time  $O(n \log n)$  to order the array.
- Expected question:
  - Why do the elements need to be unique?
- Added remark:
  - Note that if there are  $O(n)$  copies of the same element, then foobarsort takes  $O(n^2)$  to identify they are all the same, thus taking  $O(n^2)$  time.



# Organization is key

- As noted before:
  - “The preparation of a scientific paper has almost nothing to do with literary skill. It is a question of **organization.**”
- Organize material logically
  - Big things: Keep a logical flow
  - Small things: Introduce terms and acronyms before using them





# Traditional presentation

- Use of tense
  - Active “I” or “We” to present own results
  - Passive “has been done” for other work
  - Alternatively, “Jonsson showed that...”
- Baseline
  - Problem definition
  - New method
  - Statistical or theoretical results



# Many types of papers

- **Primary paper types**
  - **Theoretical contribution**
  - **Experimentally proven contribution**
- **Other types**
  - Interesting idea contribution
  - Summary of existing work
  - Challenge paper



# Lots of good material, but

- Much of science is “simpler” than CS
  - Specify problem
  - Specify mechanism of study
  - Specify methods or procedures
  - Describe results
  - Draw conclusions
- CS is sometimes a bit more complex



# Experimental CS main section

- Definition of problem (often formal)
- Definition of algorithm or approach
- Implementation of approach
- Experimental results on data
- Discussion of results
  
- Example paper: Hoffmann & Nebel



# Theoretical CS main section

- Definition of formal problem
- Definition of new structures (maybe)
- Techniques for working with structure
- Theoretical results about structure
- Discussion of results (sometimes)
  
- Example paper: Aceto et.al



# Interesting idea in CS

- Discussion of an issue
- Proposal of new approach
- Non-formal evaluation of approach
- Typically not in primary publications
  - But very appropriate in workshops etc.
  
- Example paper: Joslin et.al



# Summary paper in CS

- Specification of problem class
- Overview of work done
- Introduction of structure to tie together
- Mapping of earlier work to structure
- Conclusions about earlier work
  
- Example paper: Smith et.al



HÁSKÓLINN Í REYKJAVÍK  
REYKJAVÍK UNIVERSITY



# Challenge paper in CS

- Overview of problem (often informal)
- Overview of existing work
- New problem or problem class
- Discussion of existing work failing
- Example paper: Smith





# Source of experimental data

- Good sources
  - Real-life data, e.g., DNA data
  - Realistic simulation data, e.g., networking
- Trickier sources
  - Randomly generated data
  - Specifically set up data
- An example of a data problem
  - Randomly generated SAT problems
  - Turn out to be very easy on average



# Presenting experimental results

- Starting points
  - What results do we have
  - What do we believe they are saying
- Objective
  - Present results so others understand
  - Make sure others take from them what we intend to say



# Presenting experimental results

- Common methods
  - Graphs of various kinds
  - Tables with data
- Common problems
  - Misusing graphs for “non-scalar” x-axis
  - Unlabelled or mislabeled axes
  - Incorrect implications of “comparables”



HÁSKÓLINN Í REYKJAVÍK  
REYKJAVÍK UNIVERSITY



# Interesting links

- Writer's handbook
  - <http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/ScienceReport.html>