

TITLE OF PAPER [ARIAL, CENTRED, UPPER CASE, 12-POINT]

Author's name¹, Author's name², Author's name³ & Author's name^{4*} [11-point]

^{1,2} Faculty, University/Institution, Country [if from same faculty]

³ Faculty, University/Institution, Country [if different faculty]

⁴ Faculty, University/Institution, Country [if different faculty]

*corresponding author's e-mail address only [without hyperlink]

ABSTRACT [Max 300 words; 11-point]

The academic abstract serves as the primary gateway to scholarly literature, acting as a highly condensed, standalone representation of a comprehensive research framework. Despite its critical role in modern digital indexing, database discoverability, and initial peer-review selection, many contemporary researchers struggle to balance holistic synthesis with extreme spatial constraints. This paper investigates the underlying rhetorical architecture of successful abstracts across diverse scientific disciplines, specifically analysing the structural efficacy of structured versus unstructured formats in electronic publications. Utilising a corpus-based computational linguistic analysis of 500 high-impact e-proceeding papers published between 2022 and 2026, we map the sample text against the established five-move rhetorical model: macro-contextualisation, knowledge gap identification, methodological execution, empirical results, and theoretical implications. The resulting statistical analysis demonstrates that abstracts adhering strictly to this sequential flow achieve 34% higher digital citation rates and significantly faster editorial acceptance timelines. Furthermore, the corpus data reveals that incorporating precise quantitative metrics rather than ambiguous qualitative descriptors significantly boosts algorithmic indexing optimisation and reader retention in semantic search engines. Conversely, the inclusion of superfluous historical background or unvetted jargon was shown to drastically dilute readability scores. Ultimately, this study synthesises these empirical findings into a universal typographic blueprint. By providing a scalable, formulaic approach to text compression, this research offers global scholars an optimised framework to maximise the academic footprint and visibility of their research within strict publisher parameters, ensuring that complex scientific inquiries remain accessible, impactful, and easily retrievable in the digital age.

Key words: *key word 1, key word 2, key word 3, key word 4, key word 5*

INTRODUCTION [LEVEL 1 HEADINGS: CENTRED, BOLD, UPPER CASE, 11-POINT]

[illegible]

Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words.

LEVEL 1 HEADING

[illegible][illegible]

Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified.

Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words.

Level 2 Heading [Aligned Left, Bold, Title Case, 11-Point, No Numbering]

Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11.
No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation.
Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5.
Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified.
Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum
3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words.

Level 3 Heading [Aligned Left, Bold Italic, Title Case, 11-Point, No Numbering]

Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11.
No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation.
Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5.
Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified.
Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum
3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words.



Figure 1. Caption of the figure [Centre, only figure no. bold, sentence case, 11-point]

Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified.

Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words.

Table 1. Caption of the table [Centre, only table no. bold, sentence case, 11-point]

App Name	Usage	%
[Spacing 1.5]		

All headings should also reflect the respective contents of each part. Methodology part can be simplified (but do not use the term ‘methodology’ as heading. Instead, write a heading that reflect the approaches used) and more focus should be given on findings, conclusion, suggestion, and implication sections.

CONCLUSION

Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words. Arial. Size 11. No indentation. Spacing 1.5. Justified. Maximum 3,000 words.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT [If Applicable]

This research was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grant No. [GS-2025-894]. The authors express their gratitude to the Department of Computer Science at the University of Tech for providing the high-performance computing clusters necessary for data analysis. We also thank the anonymous peer reviewers for their invaluable feedback on earlier drafts of this manuscript.

REFERENCES [Follow APA referencing style 7th edition]

Andrews, S., & Jonson, R. M. (2022). Deep learning applications in automated text compression. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 14(3), 112–125.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacw.2022.04.012>

- Beach, J. M., Smith, K., Patel, R., Nguyen, L., Gomez, A., Kim, H., Ivanov, Y., Muller, O., Tanaka, Y., Schmidt, M., Jones, T., Davies, E., Taylor, L., Thomas, A., Roberts, W., Wilson, B., Green, C., Evans, D., Baker, P., . . . Young, K. (2020). Global linguistic shifting in digital landscapes. *PLOS ONE*, 15(4), Article e0231720. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231720>
- Findlay, I. (2018). *Business communication now* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Elson, D. (2011). International financial architecture: A view from the kitchen. In N. Visvanathan, L. Duggan, N. Wiegiersma, & L. Nisonoff (Eds.), *The women, gender and development reader* (2nd ed., pp. 295–305). Zed Books.
- National Institute of Mental Health. (2023). *Equity in digital spaces: A report on remote work burnout* (NIMH Publication No. 23-4412). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/reports/digital-burnout>
- Lynch, T. (2024). Rhetorical moves in computational linguistics abstracts. In A. Martinez (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 45–52). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCL.2024.99>
- Werneburg, B. L. (2017, May 2). *Improve your relationships with better communication*. Mayo Clinic. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/adult-health/in-depth/improve-your-relationships-with-better-communication/art-20314073>
- Canadian Mental Health Association. (n.d.). *Mental health meter*. <https://cmha.ca/mental-health-meter>
- Wood, Z. R. (2018, April). *Why it's worth listening to people you disagree with* [Video]. TED Conferences. https://www.ted.com/talks/zachary_r_wood_why_it_s_worth_listening_to_people_you_disagree