

# Resources for Technical Writing

*What additional information would you like to see on this web page?*

*Do you know of a useful resource?*

*Send suggestions/contributions to [holly@acm.org](mailto:holly@acm.org)*

## Software

**: TeX for Windows**

<http://www.miktex.org/>

**Tortoise CVS**

**Version control for windows**

<http://www.tortoise cvs.org/>

**Adobe Illustrator – commercial product**

**Available on Windows Zoo machines**

<http://www.adobe.com/products/illustrator/main.html>

**gnuplot –**

**plotting data**

<http://www.gnuplot.info/>

## Procedures/Policies

**ACM journal submission site**

<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/acm/>

**ACM journal submission site**

<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/acm/>

## Bibliographic Databases

## **ACM Guide to Computing Literature**

Includes Bibliographic references in BibTex and EndNote for ACM

and for many other publications in computing (IEEE Computing Society, INFORMS, ...)

<http://portal.acm.org/portal.cf>

## **“How to” Books and Articles**

Strunk and White on-line: “The Elements of Style”

Excellent advice and examples of composition.

<http://www.bartleby.com/141/index.html>

## **Assorted Tips and Advice**

### **Advice on technical writing from Columbia Computer Science Dept.**

A lot of good tips and useful pointers that are specific to computer science, check out the link to the automatic title generator!

<http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~hgs/etc/writing-style.html>

### ***From Prof. Rushmeier:***

Google your title

Everyone providing an intellectual contribution to the paper should be an author

The paragraphs in the introduction should not be identical to the abstract.

Don't bother to say

“We conclude with some concluding remarks”

Authors should not appear in the acknowledgements – only other people who provided help

Acknowledge funding sources at the end of the paper.

Functions may be described as monotonic, but not monotonous.

### ***From Prof. McDermott:***

*Never* harp on how revolutionary your group's work is.

Never describe your approach as “semantic” (others being “syntactic”)

Never use the word “rich” to describe a representation technique. (It tends to be a cover for “too complex to be tractable.”)

Emphasize what’s good about your approach, not what’s wrong with other approaches.