

P&M Robotics Debate 3rd session - 18/12/2019

Publishing less and better is a good strategy to build a good/useful CV?

Dynamics of the debate are as follows: a poll among the attendants is performed to know the a priori opinion. Each advocate has 2 minutes to present some of their points of view. Then, there is around 30 minutes of open debate, where the moderator will encourage particular questions of the public to the advocates. At the end, each advocate has 2 minutes for the closing remarks. Finally, a new poll will take place.

Advocates for NO	Juan Andrade and Franco Coltraro
Advocates for YES	Carme Torras and Fabio Strazzeri
Moderator	Guillem Alenyà
Note taking	Guillem Alenyà

Initial voting

YES	2
NO	12

Opening remarks

Carme opening remarks (for YES)

- General need for quality and impact. Impact in the sense of developing science that others can build upon. Avoid "half-baked results" because ideas are burned.
- Prefer not so long articles. Focus on small number of claims.
- Make an effort to write effectively. Devote some time to learn on how to communicate.
- Dissemination is very important.

Juan opening remarks (for NO)

- To build a scientific career one needs a relevant CV: journals (better from JCR and Q1), relevant conferences. He supports these claims with the requirements listed in BOE for the two last positions available at IRI.
- Impact is also boosted when publishing in the relevant places for the community, where you have chances of being read, independently of the JCR or quartile.
- Choose wisely the conferences and journals, where the top people of your area also publish.

Fabio opening remarks (for YES)

- Publishing a lot means to put pressure, and this may affect quality. This may lead to self-plagiarism.
- Publishing a lot means no time to produce good substance.

Franco opening remarks (for NO)

- More publications is useful for the scientific career.
- When publishing more you have more chances of exposing your ideas.

Debate

Publishing more means you have more **feedback**, from reviewers, from assistants in conferences. Feedback is very useful and should be appreciated.

CV serves multiple purposes. The CV may be evaluated differently when you have to compete with a lot of candidates (maybe quantity is important) or with a few (maybe quality is relevant).

To provide an idea about quantities, the rule in scientific evaluations is: one relevant individual contribution per year. But, of course, this depends on the position, scientific area, and ability/fortune in pursuing effective ideas. At the same time, quality is mandatory. One has to look for more and better papers.

Networking is very important. One needs to identify the relevant actors in the field. Special issues are a good showcase.

Q1 are not always quality publications. Some publishers specialize in low quality Q1 journals.

Conferences are a good way to communicate ideas and get feedback. If we wait too long for a journal (writing and revision may take years) it might be too late. However, when ideas are disclosed they have to be well organized and with proper support (experiments, proofs...). The journal version can be a continuation, although nowadays it requires substantial changes and improvement.

Publications are not the most important things in a CV. Look for a differential fact, that make your work **singular**. Believe in the ideas. Go for them. During the PhD, one needs to learn how to communicate, gain self-trust, and needs publications to get the PhD. After, one needs to search a differential fact. Impact can be also in form of very applied research that influences people or the way the community does things.

A way of producing quality research is to build a team with inner **synergies**. This potentially generates more and better papers. At the same time, be sure everyone in the authors' list has effectively contributed. Additionally, creating an identifiable brand (for example, IRI using the same template in presentations) may be helpful to be remembered.

Create a routine of publishing, for example, with the objective of assisting periodically to a main conference. If well done, this creates the **habit** of sitting and thinking with enough time to produce good research.

To write good articles, it is mandatory to **read** a lot, preferably good articles. A good idea is to look for advice before submitting also outside of the group, from externals. We need more reading groups to create habit.

Networking and dissemination is important: arxiv, researchgate, and other tools. Caution, uploading to these platforms may not be legal. For dissemination, IRI has people that can help to produce understandable research. Additional material helps a lot: websites, source code easy to use, datasets...

Closing remarks

Franco

Students need to improve self-confidence, habits, dissemination of ideas. Equilibrium is needed, but the more opportunities the better.

Fabio

One needs a useful CV, and less is better. People needs more focus on doing good research, and publishing pressure can be detrimental.

Juan

Nowadays, research is also about good communication. Communities have become huge. Journals and conferences help to be more visible in the community. More and better is also possible.

Carme

Time is finite and has to be devoted to relevant research. To be singular one needs to consider what to contribute, and believe in their idea. Brainstorm to gain impact, alone and in group. Let's organize a reading group?

Final vote

YES	1
NO	12

Conclusions

It is difficult to define the "less" of the title. We all agree on the idea of quality.

It is also difficult to define what a "good/useful CV" means, as different positions require different merits. But in general, a good advice is having some minimum requirements (papers, project collaborations...) and a singular fact that makes you different from your competitors.

Habits have to be created, of reading, of thinking, of communicating, of having feedback.

Networking, and creating synergies are always good tools.