Paper Chase Assignment

For this assignment, I'd like you to get into the mindset of a reviewer, and to practice the skills of hunting down references to find clarifications and explanations. I also want you to start looking around for topics for your end-of-semester project.

- Find a research paper on computational topology; let's call this Paper 1. Paper 1 can be something related to your own research that you'd like to examine more closely, or you can dive into a relevant conference/journal and pick something you find interesting. I've included a list of potential starting points at the end of this handout, but only as suggestions; you're welcome to use papers outside this list.

- Now imagine that you were assigned Paper 1 as a reviewer. The first part of any paper review is a succinct summary (at most two short paragraphs) of the major contributions of the paper. **Write that summary.** Your summary should be objective; keep your opinions about the paper limited. (An actual paper review would also include your opinions about the paper after the summary, but they will not be a part of this assignment.) Your summary should also be easy for a program committee member / editor to read. Remember that even if they have more general expertise, they know less about the paper than you do!

- **Identify and explain the major topological and computational components of the paper,** using up to one full page. Again, your summary should be objective and easy for an inexpert editor / program committee member to read. (Imagine you six months ago.)

- **Skim the rest of the paper to get a general idea of what is going on,** and then read as much detail as you can. **Describe where you got lost,** using up to one full page. (This is *not* normally part of a review.) Include enough context that your point of confusion is clear to someone who is not familiar with the paper. If you can't figure out the major contributions of the paper, start over with a different Paper 1. If you never get lost, start over with a different Paper 1.

- Identify another paper that would help enhance your understanding of Paper 1; let's call this Paper 2. This could be a paper that Paper 1 cites, a paper that cites Paper 1, or just a result of your mad googling skills. Read Paper 2, first skimming to get a general idea of its content, and then trying to read as much detail as you can. **Briefly summarize paper 2,** **describe its connection to where you got lost in paper 1,** and **describe where you got lost in Paper 2.** Use up to one full page.

- Repeat the previous step one more time. Identify yet another paper that would help your understanding of Paper 2; let's call this Paper 3. Read Paper 3. **Briefly summarize Paper 3,** **describe its connection to where you got lost in previous papers,** and **describe where you got lost in Paper 3.** Use up to one full page.

Altogether, your writeup should be roughly 3–5 pages long. Don't forget to properly cite the papers you read (and any other papers that you reference in your writeup). Please submit your writeup on Gradescope by **September 21, 2020.** The link to enroll on Gradescope will be available soon.
Choosing Papers

You're welcome to choose any three related papers on any aspect of computational topology, subject to the following restrictions:

- Don't review papers that you already know well. I want you to deliberately go outside your comfort zone. I do not expect you to understand your papers in complete detail.

- In particular, don't review any papers written by either you or your advisor; you have an obvious conflict of interest. (But you are welcome to use those papers to find other papers to read and review.)

- Similarly, don't review any of my papers; I have an obvious conflict of interest! (Again, you are welcome to use my papers to find other papers to read and review.)

I've included a list of possible starting points in the references. I've tried to choose papers that I think are relevant to this class, that describe interesting results, that are relatively accessible, and that don't look like each other. This list is skewed toward, but not limited to, papers directly related to topics that we will cover in class; please don't be offended if your favorite papers, authors, venues, or topics are missing. If you don't otherwise know where to start, I recommend looking at the abstracts and figures in these papers for something interesting. You are not required to choose your papers from this list.

Once you've chosen an initial paper to start with, there are several recommended strategies for finding additional papers to read, not only for this assignment or your project, but in your own research.

- **By citation**: Go backward in time: Look at the papers that your favorite papers cite. Or go forward in time: Look at the papers that cite your favorite papers, using an indexing service like Google Scholar or Scopus. These are often the most fruitful strategies, and the ones I recommend for this assignment, but they're not the only strategies you should use in general. Yes, of course, you always cite every possible piece of related work in your papers, but most authors don't.

- **By keyword**: Look for more papers (or lecture notes, or slides, or whatever) that use similar key terminology as your favorite papers. Try likely synonyms, even if you think they mean something completely different; different research communities use different words for the same concepts, and the same words for different concepts.

- **By venue**: Look at other papers in the venues (conference, journal, workshop, seminar series, arXiv category, Github . . .) that published your favorite papers.

- **By author**: Look at other papers (or lecture notes, or slides, or whatever) produced by the authors of your favorite papers, as well as their coauthors, students, and advisors.

- **By recommendation**: Ask people who are likely to know something about your favorite topics to suggest papers you might not otherwise think of.

- **By chance**: Keep your eyes peeled for anything vaguely reminiscent of your favorite papers: figures in other papers, Numberphile videos, old Martin Gardner columns, whiteboard scribbles, bathroom graffiti, dreams, Jack Stauber lyrics, children's toys, . . . . Use them to launch a Google Images/Scholar search. No, I'm not joking.
### Grading Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs work</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper 1 summary</strong></td>
<td>Clear summary of main contributions, and easy to follow for someone with general background in computational topology</td>
<td>Contributions are discussed, but some confusion or lack of clarity about main points or technical material</td>
<td>Summary includes some contributions, but does not rank major contributions or contains major errors</td>
<td>Completely unclear what major contributions are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper 1 tools</strong></td>
<td>Clear discussion of major topological and computational tools and techniques</td>
<td>Discussion is unclear, or focuses only on topology or only on algorithms</td>
<td>Mention of topology and/or algorithms, but vague and/or clearly indicates misunderstanding</td>
<td>Misunderstood or omitted entirely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper 1 confusion</strong></td>
<td>Clear description of where you got lost in Paper 1 and why, written for someone not familiar with the paper</td>
<td>Some discussion, but not clear what the problem was</td>
<td>No context, or discussion of paper without clear description of where you got lost</td>
<td>Omitted entirely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper 2</strong></td>
<td>Brief summary of Paper 2; connection to where you got lost in Paper 1; clear description of where you got lost in Paper 2</td>
<td>Some discussion, but not at excellent level</td>
<td>More serious inaccuracies or issues in description</td>
<td>Major issues; for example, not clear what paper 2 was about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paper 3</strong></td>
<td>Brief summary of Paper 3; connection to where you got lost in Papers 1 and 2; clear description of where you got lost in Paper 3</td>
<td>Some discussion, but not at excellent level</td>
<td>More serious inaccuracies or issues in description</td>
<td>Major issues; for example, not clear what paper 3 was about</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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