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The abstract should contain no more than 250 words. It is encouraged to include figures. The font size is 11 pt, and the line spacing is single. We understand that following formatting rules feels optional in academia, but please resist the urge to squeeze in extra text by adjusting the margins—your reviewers (and our sanity) will thank you.

The pursuit of groundbreaking results in terahertz research [1, 2] often begins with optimism and ends with a mix of exhaustion and caffeine dependence. In this work, we explore [insert topic here], an area that promises innovation but mostly delivers hours of troubleshooting. Our introduction provides a thorough literature review, carefully crafted to demonstrate that we have, in fact, read at least some of the relevant papers [3]. While past studies [4] suggest promising results, they also leave just enough unanswered questions to ensure our continued suffering—I mean, research contributions.

The experimental setup (as seen in Fig. 1, which we totally remembered to include) was meticulously designed, only to reveal new sources of noise we hadn’t previously imagined. Data collection was an iterative process involving hope, despair, and recalibrations at odd hours of the night. Nevertheless, after an undisclosed number of failed attempts, meaningful results were obtained. Our analysis, which originally aimed for perfect agreement with theory, now embraces the art of reasonable approximations. We present key findings that contribute to the field, even if their statistical significance sometimes needs a little encouragement.

**Figure 1 :** This is the caption of the figure. See we totally remembered to include it*.*

In summary, this work offers valuable insights into [insert research impact here], proving that persistence (and sheer stubbornness) can lead to meaningful progress. Further research is, of course, needed—because when is it not? Our findings highlight both the challenges and triumphs of working in terahertz science, leaving plenty of unresolved questions for future researchers to contemplate (or conveniently pass on to their students).
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*(Disclaimer: This text was generated by AI. Any resemblance to real academic struggles is purely coincidental—or maybe not. Either way, the conference organizers take no responsibility for any existential crises this abstract may induce.)*