

Akademik Üretim Süreci

Güleda Dođan
Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Bölümü
gduzyol@hacettepe.edu.tr
@guledaduzyol

Akademik Yayıncılık Semineri
4 Nisan 2019

Ankara Üniversitesi
Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi

Başlarken ...

- Akademi, bilimsel bilginin üretildiği yer
- Bilimsel üretim süreci
- Bilim, sorun çözme yöntemlerinden biri
 - Gelenekler, Hukuk, Otorite, Bireysel deneyimler, Medya, Sağduyu
- Bilimsel yöntem
 - Yapılandırılmış, düzenli, sistematik
 - Doğru olma olasılığı yüksek, hata olasılığı düşük



SCIgen - An Automatic CS Paper Generator

[About](#) [Generate](#) [Examples](#) [Talks](#) [Code](#) [Donations](#) [Related](#) [People](#) [Blog](#)

About

SCIgen is a program that generates random Computer Science research papers, including graphs, figures, and citations. It uses a hand-written **context-free grammar** to form all elements of the papers. Our aim here is to maximize amusement, rather than coherence.

One useful purpose for such a program is to auto-generate submissions to conferences that you suspect might have very low submission standards. A prime example, which you may recognize from spam in your inbox, is SCI/IIIS and its dozens of co-located conferences (check out the very broad conference description on the [WMSCI 2005](#) website). There's also a list of [known bogus conferences](#). Using SCIgen to generate submissions for conferences like this gives us pleasure to no end. In fact, one of our papers was accepted to SCI 2005! See [Examples](#) for more details.

We went to WMSCI 2005. Check out the [talks and video](#). You can find more details in our [blog](#).

Also, check out our 10th anniversary celebration project: [SCIpher!](#)

Generate a Random Paper

Want to generate a random CS paper of your own? Type in some optional author names below, and click "Generate".

Author 1:

Author 2:

Author 3:

Author 4:

Author 5:

The Impact of Pervasive Methodologies on Operating Systems

Güleda Dogan and Zehra Taskin

Abstract

Unified knowledge-based epistemologies have led to many natural advances, including flip-flop gates and IPv4 [10]. In this position paper, we validate the improvement of flip-flop gates. ZIP, our new methodology for link-level acknowledgements, is the solution to all of these grand challenges.

1 Introduction

In recent years, much research has been devoted to the analysis of symmetric encryption; on the other hand, few have analyzed the analysis of Lamport clocks [1, 11, 17, 21, 28]. Contrarily, this approach is usually considered confusing [18]. Despite the fact that prior solutions to this problem are outdated, none have taken the relational solution we propose in this position paper. Contrarily, architecture alone is able to fulfill the need for von Neumann machines.

Leading analysts always analyze game-theoretic information in the place of systems. Existing probabilistic and optimal frameworks use cache coherence to prevent access points. Even though this outcome at first glance seems unexpected, it is derived from known results. Clearly, our heuristic stores the development of

superblocks.

In this paper we disconfirm not only that the well-known interactive algorithm for the simulation of B-trees [6] is Turing complete, but that the same is true for semaphores [5, 12, 19]. We view cryptography as following a cycle of four phases: prevention, observation, improvement, and synthesis. We view software engineering as following a cycle of four phases: simulation, emulation, provision, and creation. Our heuristic is derived from the principles of machine learning.

Motivated by these observations, authenticated models and write-ahead logging have been extensively simulated by theorists. Two properties make this solution optimal: our system investigates RAID, and also our methodology turns the cooperative models sledgehammer into a scalpel. In the opinions of many, the shortcoming of this type of solution, however, is that cache coherence can be made real-time, distributed, and flexible. For example, many methodologies refine web browsers. Obviously, our heuristic stores compilers.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. For starters, we motivate the need for e-business. We confirm the refinement of write-ahead logging. We show the improvement of gigabit switches. Next, we place our work in context with the prior work in this area. Finally,





Figure 1: The decision tree used by our system.

same lines, we believe that “fuzzy” symmetries can store the development of von Neumann machines without needing to provide the understanding of redundancy. Figure 1 plots the architectural layout used by our heuristic [24]. The design for our heuristic consists of four independent components: Bayesian information, multimodal archetypes, the refinement of linked lists, and the memory bus. On a similar note, the design for our heuristic consists of four independent components: SCSI disks, trainable configurations, encrypted methodologies, and knowledge-based methodologies.

Our framework relies on the private model outlined in the recent well-known work by Takahashi et al. in the field of operating systems. We ran a minute-long trace disproving that our framework holds for most cases [8]. On a similar note, despite the results by A.J. Perlis, we can disprove that the foremost certifiable al-

Nicel araştırma sürecinin aşamaları



Akademik dergiler

- Ulusal ya da uluslararası
- Hangi dergi ulusal, hangi dergi uluslararası?
 - Tüm yayınlar Türkçe
 - Türkiye dışı yazar sayısı çok az ya da hiç yok
 - İngilizce öz/özet yer almıyor
 - Nasıl karar verilecek?

Yayın türleri

- Araştırma makalesi (research article)
- Derleme (review)
- Örnek olay incelemesi (case study)
- Kitap değerlendirmesi, yazılım/veri tabanı değerlendirmesi
- Editöryal yazı, editöre mektup, düzeltme vb.
- Hakemli / Hakemsiz

Hakemli yayın süreci

- Hakem denetimi öncesi süreç
- Hakem denetimi
- Hakem denetimi sonrası süreç



Hakem denetimi öncesi

- Konunun uygunluğu
- Sayfa sayısı, kelime sayısı, tablo-şekil sayısı sınırlamaları
- Şablona uygunluk?
- Benzerlik tespiti?
- Metodolojik kontrol?

Hakem denetimi

- Yazı kaç hakeme gönderilecek?
- Hakemlerin yazıda odaklanması gereken şeyler neler?
- Bir cümle bile yorum/eleştiri gerektirmeyen yazı var mıdır?
- Yapıcı eleştiri!
- Değerlendirme formları

Değerlendirme formları

SAGE Open

SAGE track

Home Author Review

Reviewer View Manuscripts

Reviewer View Manuscripts

- 0 Review and Score >
- 1 Scores Submitted >
- Invitations >

Scores Submitted

ACTION	COMPLETED	ID/TITLE	STATUS
Select... ▼	06-Feb-2019	SO-18-2095 	Major Revision (20-Feb-2019) a revision has been submitted Assignments: ADM: SAGE Open, Editorial Office ADM: Baumann, Bailey ADM: Parker, Sara

Değerlendirme formları

Literature review and use of references	Quality of discussion	Rationale and clarity of definition
Good	Marginal	Poor
Theoretical development of hypotheses	Legitimacy of conclusions	Writing style
Marginal	Marginal	Adequate
Quality of design and methods	Clarity and readability	Contributes to new knowledge in the field
Marginal	Adequate	Poor
Adequate data analyses	Use of references	Integration of theory (if applicable)
Marginal	Adequate	N/A

Değerlendirme formları

Recommendation

Major Revision

Confidential Comments to the Editor

Comments to the Author

Files attached

Do you want to get recognition for this review on Publons?

Yes

Değerlendirme formları

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Would benefit from additional copyediting.

Açık hakemlik

- Hakemlik türleri
- Tek körleme, çift körleme
- Bilimsel iletişim için ideal olan hangisi?
- Yaygın olan hangisi?



Effects of Stakeholder Community De

Published in SAGE Open on January 6, 2016

ABSTRACT

This article explores the effects of stakeholder negative repercussions these conflict management and resolution s

AUTHORS - I AM AN AUTHOR



C Gyan



CONTRIBUTORS ON PUBLONS

- 2 reviewers

FOLLOWERS ON PUBLONS



METRICS

Publons score (from 1 score)

6.0 | QUALITY

6.0 | SIGNIFICANCE

CONTRIBUTE



SCORE PUBLICATION

REVIEW BADGES



3 pre-pub reviews



0 post-pub reviews

IDENTIFIERS



publons.com/p/65792/



dx.doi.org/10.1177/2158244016635254

NAVIGATE

Abstract

Contributors

Metrics

Discussion

Pre-pub review, Jan 2016

Pre-pub review, Mar 2015

Publication History

Jan 2016 in SAGE Open

Recommendation: Accept

Merit: 5

Comments:

Additional Questions: Literature review and use of references: Adequate

Theoretical development of hypotheses: Adequate

Quality of design and methods: Good

Adequate data analyses: Good

Quality of discussion: Good

Legitimacy of conclusions: Good

Clarity and readability: Good

Use of references: Good

Rationale and clarity of definition: Good

Writing style: Good

Contributes to new knowledge in the field: Adequate

Integration of theory (if applicable): Adequate

Please suggest one or more reviewers for future manuscripts submitted to SAGE Open on this topic (name, e-mail, affiliation):

Would you be willing to serve as Article Editor for other manuscripts received on this topic or related topics in the future?: Yes

Do you want to get credit for your review? SAGE has partnered with Publons to offer reviewers the opportunity to record, showcase, and verify their peer review activity. Your details will be passed to Publons and if you Opt-in here you will be offered the opportunity to register for this service. If you Opt-out you will receive no further communication.: Yes

PUBLISHED IN



SAGE Open

REVIEWED BY



Natalia Piskunova

ONGOING DISCUSSION

ADD COMMENT

DETAILS



GULEDA DOGAN

Research Assistant (PhD) - Information Management, Hacettepe University

ResearcherID: I-8996-2013

ORCID: 0000-0001-7435-3181

PUBLICATIONS

22

TOTAL TIMES CITED

16

H-INDEX

2 [?]

VERIFIED REVIEWS

1

Summary

Metrics

Publications

Peer review

Editorial board memberships

CURRENT MEMBERSHIPS



Turkish Librarianship

WOS

Verified reviews



(1) SAGE Open

WOS

Hakem denetimi sonrası

- Hakemlerin kararı nihai karar mı?
- Editör onaylayıcı mı, karar verici mi?
- Son kararı editör mü hakem mi verir/vermeli?
- İki hakemin kabul verdiği bir yazı kabul edilmek zorunda mı?
- İki hakemin red verdiği yazı kabul edilebilir mi?
- Bir kabul bir red alan yazı ile ilgili süreç nasıl işleyecek?
- Tezden üretilmiş bir makale iki hakem tarafından da reddedilebilir mi?

Akademik Üretim Süreci

Güleda Doğan
Hacettepe Üniversitesi
Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Bölümü
gduzyol@hacettepe.edu.tr
@guledaduzyol

Akademik Yayıncılık Semineri
4 Nisan 2019

Ankara Üniversitesi
Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi