

## Checkpoint 2 - Select papers and implementation plan

For this checkpoint, you will be required to select at least 3 (though you could do more) research paper satisfying the standard paper requirements (e.g., 2018-2020, ICML, NeurIPS, etc. see course project description). If you want to do a research paper outside of these standard requirements, you must email the instructor and receive explicit approval over email before the due date.

This selection of papers could include the paper you summarized before or they could all be new if you decided you were interested in something else.

You should submit a PDF for peer review to [Circuit](#) that follows the ICML 2020 LaTeX guidelines. The structure should be very clear and similar to the example from checkpoint 1 on the course website. For example, you should use section headings to signify the first two required elements below. [overleaf.com](#) is recommended for LaTeX compilation. The required elements of this checkpoint are:

1. **Relationship between selected papers** - One paragraph summary describing how the papers you selected relate to each other. The relationship can be high-level but there still needs to be some relationship between papers. You should include citations to each paper in this paragraph when you discuss them.
2. **Tentative implementation plan** - One paragraph describing your tentative implementation plan. For example, which methods or experiments in which paper(s) are you planning to implement? Is there code already available, and if so, how do you plan to use that code? What datasets do you plan to use? What do you think will be the most difficult part of the implementation? What do you hope to finish for the preliminary results checkpoint (Checkpoint 4)?
3. **References (at least 3)** - Reference list for all (at least 3) papers similar to the first checkpoint. If your paper does not satisfy the standard requirements, you must state when you received approval in your submitted PDF (see checkpoint 1 example). *Make sure to include all the necessary elements of the citation (see course project description).*

The basic rubric for peer review is given below.

**1. Does the submission contain a summary of how the selected papers relate?**

<b>0 points</b> ✓ Did not include a summary paragraph.	<b>20 points</b> ✓ Summary is only 3 sentences or less.	<b>30 points</b> ✓ Summary is one paragraph or more.
---	--	---

**2. Does the submission contain a tentative implementation plan?**

<b>0 points</b> ✓ Did not include an implementation plan.	<b>20 points</b> ✓ Implementation plan is only 3 sentences or less.	<b>35 points</b> ✓ Implementation plan is one paragraph or more.
--	--	---

**3. [Paper 1] Did the submission contain an appropriate reference?**

<b>0 points</b> ✓ Did not include a reference.	<b>5 points</b> ✓ Missing PDF url, title, authors, venue, and/or year.	<b>10 points</b> ✓ Included reference with all required elements.
---	---	--

**4. [Paper 2] Did the submission contain an appropriate reference?**

<b>0 points</b> ✓ Did not include a reference.	<b>5 points</b> ✓ Missing PDF url, title, authors, venue, and/or year.	<b>10 points</b> ✓ Included reference with all required elements.
---	---	--

**5. [Paper 3] Did the submission contain an appropriate reference?**

<b>0 points</b> ✓ Did not include a reference.	<b>5 points</b> ✓ Missing PDF url, title, authors, venue, and/or year.	<b>10 points</b> ✓ Included reference with all required elements.
---	---	--

**6. How would you rank the quality of this submission relative to other submissions in the class?**

<b>1 point</b> ✓ Below average (lower 25%)	<b>3 points</b> ✓ Average (25%-75%)	<b>5 points</b> ✓ Above average (75%-100%)
---	--	---