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Outline

• Title slide
• The outline slide (this slide!)
• The rest of the slides
Q: What’s the Most Important Part of CS Research?

A: Publishing Papers!
Researcher Poll

• To get a feel for the area’s views on publishing

• Some fields represented by our pollees(??):
  • Systems
  • Machine Learning
  • Theories A, B, C, and F
  • Applied Quantum Homotopy Computation Theory (AQHCT)
Why Must We Publish??

- “Bragging rights” — 19%
- “Because we can” — 21%
- “Fame, fortune, and admiration from members of the attractive sex” — 23%
- “Assassins and hitmen hired by our beneficiaries” — 37%
What Keeps Us From Publishing, Like, All the Time?

- “I mean, we could, but we don’t want to make everyone else look bad”— 12%
- “We try, but like, conferences and journals are hard, man”— 24%
- “Too busy doing research, lolz”— 26%
- “Assassins and hitmen hired by rival universities and companies”— 38%
Let’s Help These Losers Out!!
How **Bad** Can a Paper Be Without Being **Rejected**?

Let’s Find Out!!
Methodology

• Submit a terrible paper (this paper) to a conference (this conference)

• Get accepted by any means necessary

• Publish an addendum with our results (i.e. how we got it published)
Why SIGSEGV?

• Focus on any and all fields related to CS
• Historically low acceptance rate: 0%
• Yeah
The Paper (This Paper)

- As submitted: Intro, methodology, and sub-paper
- Sub-paper: paper within a paper
- Acceptance based on only this sub-paper
- Really terrible, to set a baseline for papers that can be accepted
What Was In It?
Impenetrable Jargon-Laced Garbage

- Random vocabulary

- “Our method relies on fundamental results from Q-theory, a self-deriving, clopen super-adjunction of affine queue theory with a dash of quantum computing mixed in for that zesty flavor.”

- Defining terms and phrases

- “Define ◇-PDAs to be the recursive subset of ◇-PDAs that are the recursive subset of ◇-PDAs that are the recursive subset of […]”

- Acronyms

- “Implementing ADMR and RAMD levels 14 through 21 using HASK-8-like IRK-4 integration schemes over ASPD matrix drives proved to be quite trivial.”
Clearly False Facts

• “Taking all we have discussed so far and running it through a Markov chain algorithm, we find that advances in deep learning do in fact imply the non-existence of side channels in arbitrary TCP streams.”

• “Using the well-known fact that P=NP[citation needed], our algorithm runs in polynomial time.”

• NB: we do not specify any algorithm in our paper.

• “Our MATLAB implementation was an utter joy to build and only took a few hours to debug.”
Nonsensical Graphs

Fig. 1: DOGE/BTC exchange rate over a few hours
(Source: dogepay.com)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Case</th>
<th>BenchPress</th>
<th>ParqBench</th>
<th>BigBench</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDC-13.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>1E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XQtoOGL</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>Ω+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naïve</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Method</td>
<td>28,001</td>
<td>Pretty good</td>
<td>-18.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: If you were paying attention, you would know what this table is showing. Go reread section 2.
Straight Up Plagiarism

Fig. 3: You know who made this comic? Us.
(Source: Kris Straub, chainsawsuit.com)

- We had to remove this in the final version, unfortunately.
Uninteresting Insights

- Like, the opposite of insights (outsights???? rly makes u think)

- “Assuming the wood chucking axiom of woodchucks, we have proven a lower bound on the mass of wood that would be chucked by an arbitrary woodchuck that is strictly greater than in previous work.”

- “Our program was able to solve the games of chess and go in under 20 seconds. We later realized, however, that its answers were incorrect due to a latent (and blatant) bug.”

- “In conclusion, pbhbtphhcppththpbphthpbttphpbppthphbthphp..."
How We Did It
AKA The REAL Results
Section of Our Paper
Mostly Bribes

• First, to the PC to find out who are reviewers would be
  • Price: $0
  • "The double blind process really doesn’t matter"

• Next, to the reviewers themselves
  • Price: $1,005,138.94
  • Price per reviewer: $1,000 — $1,000,000
“That One Reviewer”

- “Waaaaa I’m a huge baby with so-called ‘morals’ and ‘principals’ and I’m too scared of repercussions to accept a bribe waaaaaaa” and then he poopied in his stupid baby diaper which was for babies (true story)

- We couldn’t find any dirt on him either

- In the end, we resorted to assassins and hitmen.

- Total Price: $2,000
Suggestions for Bribe Money Sources

• NSF grants/fellowships

• Work in industry for a few days

• Create a cryptocurrency

• Sell “magic devices” at high profit margin
  
  • YouTube video rewinders, HiFi internet routers, malware detection hardware suites, etc.
Lessons Learned

• Publishing is a fun and easy activity for the whole family to enjoy

• That one reviewer was a total jerkwad

• Being a paper reviewer is a viable retirement strategy

• The system works!
Sponsors:
I Will Now Take the Following:

- Questions (easy ones preferable)
- Comments, if unhurtful
- Non-negative criticism
- Praise
- Tips
Many meta-analysis studies include the phrase “we searched Medline, Embase, and Cochrane for studies...”

This has led to meta-meta-analyses comparing meta-analysis methods.


We performed a meta-meta-meta-analysis of these meta-meta-analyses.

**Methods**: We searched Medline, Embase, and Cochrane for the phrase “we searched Medline, Embase, and Cochrane for the phrase “we searched Medline, Embase, and Cochrane...”

Life Goal #28: Get a paper rejected with the comment “too meta”