Prof. Dr. Jasmin Blanchette
Dr. Martin Desharnais-Schäfer
Dr. Michael Kirsten
Elisabeth Lempa

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Institut für Informatik
Discussion on 14.01.2026
Homework due on 21.01.2026 at 16:00

Possible solution for Exercise Sheet 12 in

Scientific and Technical English for Computer Scientists

The exercise sheets consist of in-class exercises and homework. The in-class exercises take place during the second half of the lecture time slots. The homework, which is optional and ungraded, can be submitted via the "Homework" section in Moodle. The homework is subject to peer review.

Unless indicated otherwise, generative artificial intelligence assistants such as Chat-GPT may be used, as long as you acknowledge how you use them as specified by the Institute's policy on plagiarism.[1] However, you may not use such tools to generate peer reviews for you. In addition, we strongly recommend that you do not use them to generate entire solutions, since that would defeat the purpose of the exercises.

Homework 12-3 *Slide Critique* Choose an old slide deck related to computer science that you have developed. If you do not have one or do not want to share one, find a slide deck on the internet.

a) Write a 250-or-so-word critique of the slide deck that discusses its strengths and weaknesses.

> **POSSIBLE SOLUTION:**
>
> I found on the internet the following slide deck from a conference on neural information processing systems[a]:
>
> > Asadullah Hill Galib, Pang-Ning Tan, and Lifeng Luo, "FIDE: Frequency-Inflated Conditional Diffusion Model for Extreme-Aware Time Series Generation," *NeurIPS 2024*, 2024.
>
> The presentation begins with a complex title but is immediately supported by clear and simple visuals that effectively set the stage and frame the topic. This helps establish an accessible entry point for the audience. However, source attribution for the photos therein is incomplete, and the remainder of the presentation lacks any references, which detracts from its academic rigor.

---

[1] https://www.medien.ifi.lmu.de/lehre/Plagiate-IfI.pdf

The use of color and boldface is generally effective in highlighting key elements, including the focus, problem definition, and main objectives of the work. The overall structure is well visualized through a simple, enumerated flowchart, which also reappears on several subsequent slides to maintain continuity. Graphs are, for the most part, clear and easy to interpret, and the included formulas are limited in number and relatively straightforward. Nevertheless, the text, including the title, contains numerous abbreviations that are not defined or explained.

There are also formatting issues: Inconsistent text spacing affects readability, and multiple fonts and font sizes are used throughout without an apparent rationale. Some of the text is too small. In particular, the evaluation slides are visually cluttered and dense with unexplained abbreviations, which makes them difficult to follow. Another issue is the absence of units in measurements and graphs, which limits the interpretability of the data.

Despite these shortcomings, the overall structure of the presentation is clearly communicated, and the number of slides is appropriate for a research talk. The conclusion is of reasonable length but lacks visual impact; this could be improved by revisiting and reusing some of the engaging visuals from the introduction.

---

[a]`https://neurips.cc/media/neurips-2024/Slides/96595.pdf`

b) Sketch a poster based on the slide deck.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION:

A motivation block in the beginning could include an overlay of the visuals on generative models and block maxima with the challenge visual in its center. Then, the flow chart could be used for structuring the remaining four parts of the poster, where the structures of the next two slides could be directly used. For the experimental evaluation, slide 11 could be used with a condensed explanation of the datasets. Finally, a slightly shortened version of the conclusion could be put at the end.