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Content:

1. Introduction (F.J. Furrer)

2. Presentations and Feedback (all)

3. Final Words (F.J. Furrer)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuhrmann Robert</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:40</td>
<td>10:40 – 10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbert Hannes</td>
<td>10:45 – 11:05</td>
<td>11:05 – 11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>11:10 – 11:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig Heiner</td>
<td>11:25 – 11:45</td>
<td>11:45 – 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenicke Daniel</td>
<td>11:50 – 12:10</td>
<td>12:10 – 12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furrer, Frank J.: <em>Final Comments</em></td>
<td>12:15 - 12:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Discussion</td>
<td>12:30 – 12:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content:

1. Introduction (F.J. Furrer)
   1st Round: **Observations & Recommendations**

1. Presentations and Feedback (all)

2. Final Words (F.J. Furrer)
Peer review is the evaluation of creative work or performance by other people in the same field in order to maintain or enhance the quality of the work or performance in that field.

http://www.linfo.org/peer_review.html
### Peer-Reviewer Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vorname</th>
<th>Peer Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Peer Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Reviewer3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>Heiner</td>
<td>Schoenicke</td>
<td>Fuhrmann</td>
<td>Furrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbert</td>
<td>Hannes</td>
<td>Fuhrmann</td>
<td>Schoenicke</td>
<td>Furrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenicke</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Hilbert</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>Furrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuhrmann</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>Hilbert</td>
<td>Furrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furrer</td>
<td>Frank J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Process
Your peer reviews were fair and helpful – *but rather short*

**Peer review** is the evaluation of creative work or performance by other people in the same field in order to maintain or enhance the *quality of the work* or performance in that field

http://www.linfo.org/peer_review.html
Is delivering a peer-review report:

- A nuisance?
- An useless activity?
- An ignored work?

- A valuable scientific contribution?
- A recognized service to peers and society?
- A great step in academic and industrial recognition?
Peer Evaluations: Some "Do's"

1. Do treat the writer with courtesy and respect.

2. Do comment on the performance, not the person.

3. Do focus on how the argument is supported (or not), rather than whether you agree or disagree with it.

4. Do aim for balance and completeness in pointing out strengths and problem areas.

5. Do comment on specific examples of strengths and problem areas.

6. Do aim to help the writer see how to improve future work as well as the current draft.
Peer Evaluations: Some "Don't's"

1. Don't use snippy marginal comments such as "So what?" or "What's your point?"
2. Don't get into debates over unresolvable questions of individual value and belief (for example, questions relating to religion, gun control, or abortion).
3. Don't argue with the writer. Raise objections or ask for explanations only to clarify and suggest ways of strengthening the argument.
4. Don't confine your comments to mechanical details.
5. Don't make vague, global comments.
6. Don't rewrite for the writer.

http://www.mhhe.com/mayfieldpub/maner/resources/peer5.htm
Why are peer reviews good for the reviewer(s)?

**Academia:**
- Leads to important contacts
- Generates visibility and recognition

**Industry:**
- Massively raises the visible value of the reviewer
- Leads to invitation to project groups
Importance of good reviewers: **Academia**

- Reputation
- Conference Program Committees
- Visibility
- Networking

Feedback for Author
Decision for Publisher

Review Report

Importance of good reviewers: **Industry**

- Reputation
- Visibility
- Trust
- Expert status
- Soft Skills demonstration
Writing competent, helpful and comprehensive reviews is a strong career-enhancing activity – both in academia and in industry.
How to Write a Peer Review Report

Co-authored by wikiHow Staff

https://www.wikihow.com/Write-a-Peer-Review-Report
Feedback: Papers 1\textsuperscript{st} Draft
Papers 1st Round: Main Observations

**Theme**
All themes are well-chosen and very interesting – some are quite challenging!

**Fit to HS**
Excellent fit of all themes to Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems
Papers 1\textsuperscript{st} Round: Main Observations

\begin{itemize}
\item Context
\end{itemize}

Context is the environment in which your reader has to see your paper

\begin{itemize}
\item Full sphere of knowledge
\item Topic of your paper
\end{itemize}

Context description is the most suitable presentation of the field of interest which then allows the focussing on the topic of the paper
Focus
Restrict yourself clearly and consistently to a well-defined topic

Precision
Express exactly and unambiguously what you want to communicate
General observation:
The titles were **not** sufficiently «seducing» and promising

Good academic titles reveal not only the topic of the paper but some idea of your specific approach, argument, and area of discussion

A great academic title should tell your readers as much as possible about your paper’s central claim and its significance

*How do I write a great title for my academic essay?* University of Michigan – Sweetland Center for Writing
http://www.lsa.umich.edu/UMICH/sweetland/Home/Undergraduate/Writing%20Guides/HowDoIWriteAGreatTitle.pdf

Good Title = Promise
Audience: YOU!

- **Background:** mathematical-physical-engineering education
- **Prior knowledge:** basic nuclear physics
- **Expectations:** Possible solution to world’s energy problem?
- **Reason for attendance:** critical assessment, gain of knowledge

**Key message:**

«THORIUM – The Green Energy Source of the Future»

Richard Martin: *Superfuel – Thorium, the green energy source of the future.*
Some concepts are ill defined or not defined at all

Are really all introduced concepts necessary for the storyline? ⇐ Repeated checks & elimination necessary
SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

- **State of the Art**
- **Message of the Paper**

✓ **The state of the art:** What is the current knowledge? Which is the related literature?

✓ **Message of the paper:**
  a) what is the new knowledge?
  b) which is the contribution of the author?
  c) why is it important? \(\Leftarrow\) NOT in the conclusions, but a separate chapter before
SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

State of the Art (SoA)

Literature Research

YOUR Creativity/Idea

State of the Art Assessment

YOUR contribution

Prior Knowledge

SoA Advancement

«My contribution»

- Didactic (tutorial)
- Scientific (New results)
- Technical (New applications)
- Disruptive (New field)
- Methodical (New ways)
Language
• German
• English

Use proofing tools!

Use a spell checker!
https://www.grammarly.com
http://www.whitesmoke.com/
etc.
... and: You all *underestimated* the required time!

Consequence:

- Stress
- Dissatisfaction with yourself
- Unsatisfactory result
- Bad conscience
- Unhappy teacher 😞
What can you do against time-stress?

**Planning**

**Plan 1**: Storyline $\Leftarrow$ Conceptual plan of content

**Plan 2**: Time-plan – Chapter/Section $\Leftarrow$ date
Die meiste Zeit geht dadurch verloren, dass man nicht zu Ende denkt

Alfred Herrhausen (1930-1989)
Writing convincing and admirable papers is a **key factor** for career success.

The impact or "quality" of a paper is assessed by counting the number of times **other** authors refer it in their work.
David Lindsay:
Scientific Writing = Thinking in Words

CSIRO Publishing (Australia)
2013
ISBN 978-0-643-10046-6
Fazit: Writing a **good** paper is **very hard** work!
Content:

1. Introduction (F.J. Furrer)

2. Presentations and Feedback (all)

3. Final Words (F.J. Furrer)
SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

Procedure

Presentation (20 mins)

Audioen Feedback (5 mins)

FEEDBACK: Each participant:
1. One positive comment
2. One improvement comment

Storyline
- Logical
- Consistent
- Attractive
- Clear
Excellent □
Good □
Improvable □

Illustrations
Pictures
- Fitting/Adequate
- Creativity
- Power of expression
- Support of Speaker
Excellent □
Good □
Improvable □

Animation
- Focused (emphasizing the message of the slide)
- Speed
- Unnecessary effects
- Timing
Excellent □
Good □
Improvable □

Density
- Too dense (per slide or per time unit)
- Too thin (more material per slide or per time unit)
- Balance of slides
- Bullet point lists
Excellent □
Good □
Improvable □

Delivery
- Personal style
- Interaction with the audience
- Complementary speech/illustrations
Excellent □
Good □
Improvable □
### SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storyline</th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Excellent ✓</th>
<th>Good ✓</th>
<th>Improvable ✗</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations</td>
<td>Fitting/Adequate</td>
<td>Granularity</td>
<td>Power of Expression</td>
<td>Support of Speaker</td>
<td>Excellent ✓</td>
<td>Good ✓</td>
<td>Improvable ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>Focussed (message of the slide)</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>Unnecessary effects</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Excellent ✓</td>
<td>Good ✓</td>
<td>Improvable ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>Balance of slides</td>
<td>Bullet point lists</td>
<td>Excellent ✓</td>
<td>Good ✓</td>
<td>Improvable ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Personal style</td>
<td>Interaction with the audience</td>
<td>Complementary speech/illustrations</td>
<td>Excellent ✓</td>
<td>Good ✓</td>
<td>Improvable ✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Precise</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>“catching”</td>
<td>Excellent ✓</td>
<td>Good ✓</td>
<td>Improvable ✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective for 2nd presentation:**

6 x «excellent»
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuhrmann Robert</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:40</td>
<td>10:40 – 10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbert Hannes</td>
<td>10:45 – 11:05</td>
<td>11:05 – 11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td>11:10 – 11:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig Heiner</td>
<td>11:25 – 11:45</td>
<td>11:45 – 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenicke Daniel</td>
<td>11:50 – 12:10</td>
<td>12:10 – 12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furrer, Frank J.: <em>Final Comments</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:15 - 12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 – 12:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... the stage is yours!
### SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storyline</strong></td>
<td>• Logical</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attractive</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustrations</strong></td>
<td>• Fitting/Adequate</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Granularity</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Power of Expression</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support of Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animation</strong></td>
<td>• Focused (message of the slide)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Speed</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unnecessary effects</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>• Too high</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too low</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Balance of slides</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bullet point lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>• Personal style</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interaction with the audience</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complementary speech/illustrations</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Precise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• „catching“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Robert Fuhrmann
- √

© Prof. Dr. Frank J. Furrer – SS 2019
### SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

#### Hannes Hilbert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storyline</strong></td>
<td>• Logical, Consistent, Attractive, Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustrations Pictures</strong></td>
<td>• Fitting/Adequate, Granularity, Power of Expression, Support of Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animation</strong></td>
<td>• Focussed (message of the slide), Speed, Unnecessary effects, Timing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>• Too high, Too low, Balance of slides, Bullet point lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>• Personal style, Interaction with the audience, Complementary speech/illustrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message</strong></td>
<td>• Precise, True, „catching“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvable □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuhrmann Robert</td>
<td>10:20 – 10:40</td>
<td>10:40 – 10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilbert Hannes</td>
<td>10:45 – 11:05</td>
<td>11:05 – 11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>11:10 – 11:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig Heiner</td>
<td>11:25 – 11:45</td>
<td>11:45 – 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenicke Daniel</td>
<td>11:50 – 12:10</td>
<td>12:10 – 12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furrer, Frank J.: <em>Final Comments</em></td>
<td>12:15 - 12:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Discussion</td>
<td>12:30 – 12:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Improvable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storyline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustrations</strong></td>
<td>Fitting/Adequate</td>
<td>Granularity</td>
<td>Power of Expression</td>
<td>Support of Speaker</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animation</strong></td>
<td>Focussed (message of the slide)</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>Unnecessary effects</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>Too high</td>
<td>Too low</td>
<td>Balance of slides</td>
<td>Bullet point lists</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Personal style</td>
<td>Interaction with the audience</td>
<td>Complementary speech/illustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message</strong></td>
<td>Precise</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>„catching“</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Improvable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heiner Ludwig

√
## Storyline
- Logical
- Consistent
- Attractive
- Clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvable</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Illustrations Pictures
- Fitting/Adequate
- Granularity
- Power of Expression
- Support of Speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvable</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Animation
- Focussed (message of the slide)
- Speed
- Unnecessary effects
- Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvable</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Density
- Too high
- Too low
- Balance of slides
- Bullet point lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvable</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Delivery
- Personal style
- Interaction with the audience
- Complementary speech/illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvable</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Message
- Precise
- True
- „catching“

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvable</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Daniel Schoenicke

☑
Content:

1. Introduction (F.J. Furrer)

2. Presentations and Feedback (all)

3. Final Words (F.J. Furrer)
Papers and Presentations do *transport* ideas

Be:

- focussed
- precise
- interesting
- understandable
- direct
3 main areas of improvement:

Title

... catching
... promising
... seducing

Storyline

... logical
... "simple"
... convincing

Unnecessary Concepts

... minimize
... define
... consistency
Key message:
«THORIUM
– The Green Energy Source of the Future»

Consequences and Dangers of Uranium-Technology

Need for a new, clean and safe energy generation technology

Survey and assessment of energy generation technologies

Logical line of thought:
- Radioactive waste
- Nuclear accidents
- Plutonium (weapons)

- environment
- zero accident potential
- Large scale affordability

- «green energy»
- Nature protection
- Long-term sustainability
Decision & justification for Thorium reactors

Previous work & State of the art

My contribution

Theory of Thorium Reactors (Th$^{90}$ Nuclear Chain reaction)

Implementation of Thorium Reactors (Th$^{90}$ breeders)

- «green energy» (CO$_2$, …)
- Practically no waste
- Practically unlimited supply

- US Oak Ridge reactor
- Theory
- Current work

- SoA description
- Assessment of promises
- Recommendations

- Some nuclear theory
- Breeder function
- Fuel chain

- Reactor types
- LFTR
SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

Safety, environmental assessment and long-term sustainability

- Emergency mechanisms
- Waste analysis
- Plutonium burner

Findings & Recommendations

- Continue research
- Build CH-expertise (ETH)
- Generate confidence (Public)

Conclusions: Main points and future work

- «Message»
- Lessons
- Reason for further work

References

- Best possible
- Easily available
- To the point

Acknowledgments

- Fair
- Truthful
- Complete
Eliminate unnecessary concepts

- Mark all **concepts** in your paper
- Is each concept really necessary? ⇒ if **not**, eliminate the concept
- Are all the concepts well and precisely defined? ⇐ **ambiguity**?
Format of the Slides ⇒ Navigation Help!

Hauptseminar SS 2016: «Autonomic Computing»

Affiliation

Title/Topic

Date

Copyright

Author

Page #
What must your audience take home?

Your Message!

... and the methods, insights, results of your work
SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

Your Message

http://footage.framepool.com

Clear?
True?
Important?

yes  no

√  √  √
Intellectual Property Ownership (1/2)

Intellectual property (IP) is a category of property that includes intangible creations of the human intellect


Intellectual property is often protected and needs permission to be reused

Four types of intellectual property:

• Trade Secrets
• Trademarks™
• © Copyrights
• Patents

1) Make sure that you have the correct rights of use for the intended usage

2) Clearly state © Copyrights and Trademarks™ if you reuse

3) Strictly name sources (References, etc.)

4) No plagiarism (Never, not intentional nor accidental)
## SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

### Next Steps

| 1st Seminar Day | Wednesday, June 19, 2019: 09:20 – 10:50/11:10 - 12:40 (2. + 3. DS), Room APB/INF 2101 | Participants presentations  
Peer discussions, Feedback on style & content |
|---|---|---|
| Deliver 2nd, improved draft of your paper to your peer reviewers **No storyline update required** | Friday, June 28, 2019 | e-mail your paper:  
- Your peer reviewers  
[frank.j.furrer@bluewin.ch](mailto:frank.j.furrer@bluewin.ch) |
| Feedback from Reviewers | Monday, July 8, 2019 | By e-mail from:  
- Your peer reviewers  
[frank.j.furrer@bluewin.ch](mailto:frank.j.furrer@bluewin.ch) |

However, a **graphical storyline check** is recommended and welcome

**Planning & Time Management**
Garr Reynolds:

**Presentation Zen**
Simple Ideas on Presentation Design and Delivery

New Riders, 2nd revised edition, 2011
ISBN 978-0-3218-1198-1
The first objective is to ensure that what you think you have said is the same as what the reader thinks you have said.

David Lindsay, 2013, ISBN 978-0-643-10046-6
Questions or Comments?
SS19: Engineering Trustworthy Cyber-Physical Systems

| 2nd Seminar Day | Wednesday, July 10, 2019: 09:20 – 10:50/11:10 - 12:40 (2. + 3. DS), Room APB/INF 2101 | • 2nd participants presentation  
• Peer discussions, Feedback on style and content |

2nd Seminar Day

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See you soon ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>