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An overview of my Journey

- Started 3 years ago (2008-2010)
- Heaps of works, ups and downs
During my First Year

- Bombarded with questions
Lesson Learned

- Choose your supervisor well
  - Get more out of your relationship than a degree
Lesson Learned

- Time fly fast-Plan it wisely
Lesson Learned

- Don’t waste your first year
- Get a life
During my Final Year

The Chapters of my Life
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During my Fourth year

- frustration is escalating
- Still more to come

ADDRESSING REVIEWER COMMENTS
BAD REVIEWS ON YOUR PAPER? FOLLOW THESE GUIDELINES AND YOU MAY YET GET IT PAST THE EDITOR:

Reviewer comment: “The method/device/paradigm the authors propose is clearly wrong.”

How NOT to respond: ✗ “Yes, we know. We thought we could still get a paper out of it. Sorry.”

Correct response: ✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, as the focus of this work is exploratory and not performance-based, validation was not found to be of critical importance to the contribution of the paper.”

Reviewer comment: “The authors fail to reference the work of Smith et al., who solved the same problem 20 years ago.”

How NOT to respond: ✗ “Huh. We didn’t think anybody had read that. Actually, their solution is better than ours.”

Correct response: ✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, our work is based on completely different first principles (we use different variable names), and has a much more attractive graphical user interface.”

Reviewer comment: “This paper is poorly written and scientifically unsound. I do not recommend it for publication.”

How NOT to respond: ✗ “You #&*@% reviewer! I know who you are! I’m gonna get you when it’s my turn to review!”

Correct response: ✓ “The reviewer raises an interesting concern. However, we feel the reviewer did not fully comprehend the scope of the work, and misjudged the results based on incorrect assumptions.”