

SIGGRAPH 2004 Project Written Report Guide

Why a final report?

The main purpose of the final report to provide your classmates with a useful aid to understanding the paper that your group studied. I will also use it to assess your level of understanding of the material. I will do this by reading your explanations and analyses of different aspects of the paper.

The final report is not directly about your implementation work. That's assessed separately, through the source code that you submit and your final presentation and demo.

The final report must all be your own writing. No quotes or paraphrases. All group members are responsible for checking that the report that they submit is not copied or paraphrased from elsewhere.

Quotes and paraphrases are not allowed because I want to assess how much *you* understand, not what someone else understands.

What is the format of the final report?

I'm constraining the format to make it simpler for you to construct your report. Your report should contain the following sections:

1. A brief explanation of the problem that the SIGGRAPH paper attempts to solve. What is claimed about this particular technique that is not true of previously published techniques? (1-2 paragraphs)
2. A brief explanation of the solution to the problem that the SIGGRAPH authors propose. How does it solve the problem that it is supposed to solve? What is new about it? (1-3 paragraphs)
3. In depth explanations of theoretical aspects of the SIGGRAPH paper or its background that relate to the learning objectives for your paper. Don't simply restate what's in the paper or other sources. Explain just the difficult and unclear parts in such a way that an average 715 student can understand. Refer to useful outside resources. Use diagrams as appropriate. If you use complex formulas or maths that an average 715 student will find difficult, be sure to explain them carefully. (Length will vary depending on topic; probably 15-20 pages. Four person groups should be providing more information in this section.)
4. A listing of aspects of the learning objectives that you still don't understand. Include formulas and algorithms that you know how to use but don't understand how or why they work. It's perfectly respectable not to understand some things; just don't claim that you understand more than you do. If you seem to be claiming more than you understand, you may be queried about this. (Length will vary, but probably not more than a page.)
5. An evaluation of the testing of the algorithm that the authors report in the SIGGRAPH paper. Is their testing adequate and do their results back up their claims? (1-2 paragraphs)
6. A discussion of the limitations or flaws of the technique as published. Are there limitations or flaws to the technique that the SIGGRAPH authors don't make clear, or don't report at all? (You may want to include the findings of your own experiments here.) (Length depends on how many limitations and flaws you find, and how hard it is to explain them. Probably 2-3 pages.)
7. Your overall assessment of the paper and the impact it will have on the field (1 paragraph)
8. A complete list of references (electronic and otherwise) that you used in learning about the paper, annotated with a brief statement for each reference indicating what it was useful for and how hard it is to understand.

The lengths above are only rough indications. Do not resort to superficial efforts to meet the length guidelines, such as using a tiny font, or padding your text with unnecessary phrases or pictures. Your main goal is to create a document that will be helpful to others studying the paper and which adequately reflects what the group learned about the paper in three weeks of investigation.