In this next module, we're going to practice applying the concepts that you've learned in both units one and two. I'm going to, flash them sentences up on the screen, and then I'm going to walk you through how I would edit them. It's fine to just watch the video from start to finish, but if you want some extra practice, you might try pausing the video and attempting the edits on your own before watching my edits, I have, provided the text as a resource alongside this video.

This is a two sentences example that I love because it has a good story behind it. When I first started teaching at Stanford, some of my students were taking a course on statistics in another department, and the textbook for that course was about 3 inches thick. I'm only exaggerating slightly. The students struggled with that course, I think, largely attributable to that hard to read textbook. And I ended up teaching an alternate course in statistics for them, which was the generation of my teaching statistics at Stanford. Here, I'm showing a couple of sentences from the introduction of that textbook. This is not even any of the technical material, but it gives you a sense of why that book was unnecessarily long and hard to read. In particular, I'm going to highlight the problems that this passage has with verbs. Will also clean up some sentence clutter.

The first sentence reads, **the fear expressed by some teachers that students would not learn statistics well if they were permitted to use canned computer programs, has not been realized in our experience.** All right, what's the subject of that sentence? The subject is the fear. It's a really long subject, though, because we don't get into the to the main verb or the predicate until has not been realized. This is an example where the authors take too long to get to the main verb of the sentence, and then the verb is a boring, passive verb. Also. This is an instance where we have got a noun the fear, which could have been an exciting verb to fear.

Now look at the second sentence. It has the same issues. Again, we have this incredibly long subject. The subject is the monitoring, with all this extra description about the monitoring, monitoring afterwards. And we don't get to the main verb until revealed, which is also a boring verb. Notice again that monitoring is a noun that could have been a verb to monitor. I'll just find out a few other issues with this passage. Notice the use of negatives. They would not learn statistics that has not been realized. Last week, we talked about turning negative constructions into positive constructions, and here's an example where you can see just how awkward those knots sound. So we should try to edit those out. Also in the second sentence, you get this hedge word No appreciable change in students' performances. Be careful with hedge words. Scientists love to put the hedge words in, but they are often unnecessary and raise all sorts of questions. When I read that hedge word, it opens up a can of worms for me. I'm like, oh, this was written by a statistician. And what do they mean by no appreciable change? Does that mean there was a change and it just didn't achieve statistical significance? What are they trying to bury in that word? Appreciable? So be careful. If there was really no meaningful change, they just say there was no change. Get rid of the hedge words.

So here's what I edited this down to **Many teachers feared that the use of canned computer programs would prevent students from learning statistics. We monitored student achievement levels before and after the introduction of computers in our course, and found no detriments in performance.** Notice how I turned the nouns fear and monitoring back into verbs feared and monitored, which allowed me to get the subject of the sentence in the main verb close together at the beginning of the sentence. And I also cleaned up the language a bit. Notice how it reads much more smoothly.

Now, here's another example. **Review of each center's progress in recruitment is important to ensure that the cost involved in maintaining each center's participation is worthwhile.** This example, and the rest of examples in this module are all real examples from papers I was editing here. Uh, we've got another long subject, right? The subject of this sentence is review of each center's progress in recruitment. So again, that problem with very long subjects. We also have the issue of verbs turn to nouns. Review is a noun, a review That could have been a verb two review. Instead of getting a nice verb review, here we get that boring verb is the boring to be verb. We also have some empty, vague descriptors, like important and worthwhile. These are vague because what specifically makes it important, what makes it worthwhile? Try to avoid empty words like that. Be specific. We also have some clunky phrases, like involved in maintaining That sounds a little awkward.

What I did to edit this one is, instead of saying, the review is important to do, I made it an imperative we should review each centers recruitment progress to make sure its continued participation is cost effective. Notice that instead of saying worthwhile, which is vague, I'm saying cost effective, which is more specific. This is specifically what we're going to be evaluating about these centers. You could probably even strip a few more words from this sentence, but it's a big improvement on the first version.

Here's another example. **It should be emphasized that these proportions generally are not the result of significant increases in moderate and severe injuries, but in many instances, reflect mildly injured persons not being seen at a hospital.** As I read this out loud, you can hear that it's awkward, right? First we get this kind of dead weight phrase, that clearing of the throat. It should be emphasized that we can cut that completely. The fact that you are writing about something in your paper means you're putting emphasis on it. Then we get these proportions. It’s a little bit vague here, the authors are referring back to something they've been talking about in a previous sentence, but it would be helpful if they used a more informative adjective. I'm actually going to change this one to shifting proportions, because that's what the authors are referring to here. There is a shift in proportions. They are seeing more severe and moderate injuries and fewer mild injuries at the hospital. So it's a shifting proportion. We then get an adverb. Remember, it told you to cut adverbs, so we're just cut. Generally doesn't add anything, so we can remove it. We also get some wordiness, uh, the result of that could just be shortened to do to. We also get in many instances, which also could be cut or shortened. You could just say often. You probably also heard those knots, right? Uh, not. The result of not being seen in a hospital. You can hear how awkward that sounds. So let's try to turn those into positives. Then we get a little bit of an awkward to be verb, not being seen at the hospital. That's a little bit awkward. So let's change that. You don't actually have the context here, um. But so to edit this, you just need to step back and kind of ask yourself, what is it the authors we are trying to say? They're trying to explain an observation that all of a sudden, hospitals are reporting more severe injuries and less mild ones. What they're telling you is that this shift may not reflect a real increase in modern in severe injuries, but rather might have to do with people with mild injuries just not ever checking into a hospital. That maybe doctors are deciding not to admit my older cases into the hospital to save money.

So I reread this one too. **Shifting proportions in injury severity may reflect stricter hospital admission criteria, rather than true increases and in moderate and severe injuries.** Notice, I got rid of that. It should be emphasized that the knots the awkward freezing and I boiled it down to the main point, the possible explanation for the shift in proportions that the authors have observed.

Here's another one, **important studies to examine the descriptive epidemiology of autism, including the prevalence and changes in the characteristics of the population over time, have begun.** All right, what are some of the problems with this sentence? Notice again that the subject and main verb are too far apart. The subject of that sentence is the studies. We don't get to the main verb until way at the end of the sentence, have begun. So we need to fix that. Also, again, watch those vague fluff words like important. In this case, it sounds like the authors are saying that these studies are important, but that might imply that there are other studies out there that aren't important. And it also raises the question, what makes them important? And who's judging that they're important? And what do you mean by important? So watch those kinds of fluff words. We also get, uh, this changes over time. Did you notice that this is redundant? Since you cannot have changes that are not over time, changes, by the definition, always occur over time. So changes over time is kind of like successful solutions, like we saw last week. Finally, the of the population at the end, that's vague. Unless you're gonna specify a particular population, then of the population is just too vague. It doesn't add anything, so we should cut it.

So I edited this one too. **Studies have begun to describe the epidemiology of autism, including recent changes in the disorders, prevalence and characteristics.** Notice, I've moved the verb have begun way up in the sentence. I also condensed examine the descriptive epidemiology to describe the epidemiology. Note the use of the verb there. I also get rid of important and I dropped of the population, so it's much cleaner and more direct.

Here's another example. **There are multiple other mechanisms that are important, but most of them are suspected to only have a small impact, or are only important because of impact on one of the three primary mechanisms.** We don't have the context here, but you can figure it out. In the previous sentence, the authors must have talked about the three primary mechanisms, and in this sentence, they're trying to qualify that there are other mechanisms at work, but they're not going to vote to devote much attention to them. That's the gist. Let's go through and see what things we can edit. first of all, notice that there are, I told you last week, that you can often cut out there are altogether. This is one of those instances we can cut out there are and just jump right into multiple other mechanisms. And then we get important. I've already told you before to watch out for that fluff word. We can get rid of that word important. We don't need it at all. Here, The word important, in a way, is actually contradictory, because the authors are saying in one breath that these other mechanisms are important, but then in the next breath, they're saying, oh, they only have small impacts. Those two things don't dovetail. So let's just again remove the word important. I also want to get rid of this boring to be verb the are here. Instead of saying, multiple other mechanisms are, we could say multiple other mechanisms play a role, play a role in this. And then we get to Most of them are suspected to only have a small impact. That's very wordy. Our suspected to is a is needlessly word, and it's also a hedge word that we probably don't need here. We don't need to hedge. We're really saying they have small impact, so there's no need to hedge. So we could say, multiple other mechanisms, and then let's just dive in and be really direct. Multiple other mechanisms play only a small role. If we say play only a small role, we can get rid of all of this play. We'll change this to only a small room, or are important because of impact on one of the three primary mechanisms? Well, we can condense that a little bit. We can say multiple other mechanisms play only a small role, or work by impacting one of the three primary mechanisms. Again, we can get rid of that important again. And instead of saying, because of impact, we can say, work by impacting or work by impacting one of the three primary mechanisms. So it all boils down now to multiple other mechanisms play only a small role, or work by impacting one of the three primary mechanisms. Notice how much we were able to drop here. And notice we didn't lose anything by getting rid of that hedge that are suspected to We really didn't need a hedge in there.

Okay, here's another example. **After rejecting paths with poor signal to noise ratios, we were left with 678 velocity measurements of waves with 7.5 second periods, and 809 one 891 measurements of 15 second waves.** You can hear there's some repetition in here. There’re several things we can get rid of. One thing is we've got this after rejecting paths with poor signal to noise ratios we were I think we can shorten that just a little bit. I would just say rejecting paths with poor signal to noise ratios left us with We can just be a little bit more direct and drop a few words. That does make that subject a teeny bit long here, but I actually think it works in this case. And then the fact that you rejected them left a certain number of measurements. And we can condense this description of the measurements a little bit. We've got some repetition here. So left 678 velocity measurements of… and let's just, say 7.5 second waves. It's a little bit shorter, so 7.5 second waves and 890, 01:15 second ways. Let's just get rid of the extra measurements we've already said measurements, so we can boil this one down to rejecting paths with poor signals noise ratios left 678. Velocity measurements of 7.5 second waves in 891 of 15 second waves.

All right, here's the next example. **It is suspected that the importance of temperature has more to do with impacting rates of other reactions then being a mechanism of disinfection itself. Since ponds are rarely hot enough for temperature alone to cause disinfection**. We have to guess the context a bit here. But probably in the prior sentence, the authors were telling us something about the importance of temperature in disinfecting ponds. In this sentence, now they're telling us that it's not that the high temperature directly causes the water to boil and directly kills the microorganisms. Is not that the heat directly kills them. Rather, the disinfection may be happening because the hotter temperatures speed up other reactions that disinfect. I'm actually going to reorganize this sentence. It starts with It is suspected that, again, there's that hedge um. Instead using all those hedge works, you might just say, likely or me. And then we get importance again, that word important, that importance of temperature. Probably the previous sentence already told us that we had, um, that the temperature was important. So I'm gonna just kind of strike all that. And in fact, I'm going to reorder this sentence. The part I liked best was at the end here, when it says, ponds are rarely hot enough for temperature alone to cause disinfection. I like just jumping in to that explanation there. We're expecting that maybe it's the temperature itself that causes the disinfection, and they are right off the bat saying, no, that's not the case. So let's start with that kind of nice direct I'm going to make that the beginning of the sentence, and, um. And then I'm just going to tack on a little bit at the end of that, gets to this, the rest of these ideas here. So I'm going to put a semicole. And ponds are rarely hot enough for temperature alone to cause disinfection. Thus, and let's get the rest of the explanation now. Thus, the effect of temperature is likely mediated through its impact on the rates of other reaction. So thus, the effect of temperature is likely mediated. And I like this word media. That gets the idea here. Those likely media. That's a good verb. Um. And then we can just do through the rates of other reactions, that we can get rid of all of this. And I'll just put the the complete edit here without me writing the whole thing out. So ponds are rarely hot enough for temperature alone to cause this infection, thus the effective temperature is likely media through its impact on the rates of other reactions.

Finally, one more practice example. This was actually the last sentence of an abstract, and so the authors were trying to tell you what their conclusion was. It's a little hard to get that, because they're being really indirect here by saying, it was assumed that we'd rather have something like we concluded it was assumed that… is confusing. There's a lot of things we can cut here. It was assumed that obviously we want to get rid of that altogether. That is just confusing. Then we get to this due to reduced work at the joints of the lower limbs and less energy loss in the prosthetic leg. Let's be more direct here. What the authors are trying to say is that the prosthetic leg has an effect that they discovered in their paper. It seems to reduce the work of a lower leg joint and to reduce the energy loss in the lower leg joint compared with a healthy ankle. So let's just rearrange this to say that directly, so we can just say the prosthetic leg, and we'll say reduces, because this is an observation that they're about to explain. The prosthetic leg reduces work and energy loss. We don't need to repeat lower limb twice. Reduces work and energy loss compared with a healthy ankle joint. And I'm going to get rid of the word complex. We don't need healthy ankle joint complex. Let's just say, compared with a healthy ankle joint. So I'm actually kind of going to get rid of this, and I'm going to condense this at the end. So we're going to say, compared with a healthy ankle joint, and then that observation from the paper leads them to speculate about something. And we're going to put the speculation at the end, so I'm just going to tack that on the end. I'm going to add on, sort of summarizing the rest of the sentence in in shorter form, which may lead to lower metabolic costs during maximum sprinting. I'm just, I'm not going to write that out. I'll just show you the final edit here. So we start by being direct The prosthetic leg reduces work in energy lost compared to the healthy ankle joint, , and that that observation leads the authors to believe that that may lead to lower metabolic costs during maximum sprinting.

在下一个模块中，我们将练习应用您在第一单元和第二单元中学到的概念。我将在屏幕上闪烁一些句子然后我将带你了解如何编辑它们。从头到尾都看视频是可以的，但是如果你想要一些额外的练习，你可以尝试暂停视频并自己尝试编辑，然后再观看我的编辑。我在这段视频旁边提供了文字作为资源。这是我喜欢的一个两句话的例子，因为它背后有一个很好的故事。当我刚开始在斯坦福大学任教时，我的一些学生正在另一个系上统计学课程。而且那门课程的教科书厚约三英寸，我只是稍微夸大其词。学生们为那门课程苦苦挣扎。我认为这在很大程度上要归因于那本难以阅读的教科书。最后我为他们教了一门统计学的替代课程，那是我在斯坦福大学的教学统计学的产生。在这里，我展示的是那本教科书介绍中的几句话。这甚至不是任何技术材料，但它可以让你了解为什么那本书不必要地冗长且难以阅读。特别是，我将重点介绍这段话在动词方面存在的问题。我们还将清理一些混乱的句子。第一句话写道，根据我们的经验，一些老师担心如果允许学生使用罐装的计算机程序，他们将无法很好地学习统计学，这种担忧尚未实现。好吧，那句话的主语是什么？主题是恐惧。不过，这是一个很长的话题。因为我们要等到没有意识到主动词或谓词才会进入主动词或谓词。因此，这是一个例子，作者花了太长时间才找到句子的主动词，然后动词是一个无聊的被动动词。还有一个例子，我们有一个名词“恐惧”，它本来可以是一个令人兴奋的恐惧动词。现在看看第二句话它也有同样的问题。再说一遍，我们有这个长得令人难以置信的话题。主题是监控，还有所有这些关于之后的监控的额外描述。而且我们要等到透露才会谈到主动词。这也是一个无聊的动词。再次注意，监视是一个名词，可以包含要监视的动词。我只想指出这段话的其他几个问题。注意底片的使用。他们不会学习统计数据，但这一点尚未实现。上周，我们谈到了将负面结构转化为积极的建构。这里有一个例子，你可以看到那些音符听起来有多尴尬。因此，我们应该尝试将其编辑出来。另外，在第二句话中，你会得到这个对冲词。学生的表现没有明显的变化。谨慎使用对冲词。科学家们喜欢用套期保值词，但它们通常是不必要的，会引发各种各样的问题。当我读到那个对冲词时，它给我带来了麻烦。我想，这是统计学家写的。他们所说的没有明显的变化是什么意思？这是@@否意味着发生了变化，只是没有达到统计学意义？他们想用这个词掩盖什么，值得赞赏？所以要小心。如果真的没有有意义的变化，那就说没有有意义的变化就行了。摆脱对冲这个词。因此，以下是我编辑的内容。许多教师担心，使用罐装计算机程序会阻碍学生学习统计数据。我们在课程中引入计算机之前和之后对学生的成绩水平进行了监测，发现成绩没有受到任何损害。注意我是如何将名词“恐惧和监视”变成动词、恐惧和监视的，这使我能够理解句子的主语和主动词。紧密相连，在句子的开头。而且我还清理了一下语言。请注意它现在读起来更加流畅。再举一个例子，“审查每个中心的招聘进展对于确保维持每个中心的参与所涉及的成本是值得的。”这个示例和本模块中的其余示例都是我正在编辑的论文中的真实示例。在这里，我们还有另一个很长的话题。对吧？这句话的主题是审查每个中心的招聘进展情况。再说一遍，很长的主题有这个问题。我们还有动词变成名词的问题。评论是一个名词。一篇本来可以是动词的评论，可以回顾。我们没有在这里得到一个不错的动词评论，而是那个无聊的动词，是。无聊的“tobe”动词。我们还有一些空洞的、模糊的描述词，比如“重要”和“值得”。这些之所以含糊不清，是因为什么特别使它变得重要？是什么让它值得？尽量避免这样的空话。具体一点。我们还有一些笨拙的短语，例如参与维护。这听起来有点尴尬。我为编辑这篇文章所做的不是说评论很重要。我把它当作当务之急。我们应该审查每个中心的招聘进度，以确保其持续参与具有成本效益。请注意，与其说值得（含糊不清），不如说更具成本效益，这更具体。这正是我们要对这些中心进行评估的具体内容。你甚至可以从这句话中再删掉几个字，但它比第一个版本有了很大的改进。这是另一个例子。应该强调的是，这些比例通常不是中度和重度伤害显著增加的结果，但在许多情况下，这反映了没有在医院就诊的轻伤人员。当我大声朗读这篇文章时，你可以听见它很尴尬，对吧？首先，我们得到这样的沉重短语。那清喉咙，应该强调的是。我们可以完全削减它。你在论文中写一些关于某件事的事实意味着你在强调它。然后我们得到这些比例，有点模糊。在这里，作者指的是他们在前一句话中一直在谈论的事情。但是，如果他们使用更具形成性的形容词，那会很有帮助。实际上，我要把这个改成不断变化的比例，因为这就是作者在这里所指的。比例发生了变化，他们看到的中度伤害更严重，医院的轻度伤害也减少了，比例发生了变化。然后我们得到一个副词，记住我已经叫你删掉副词所以我们要大致削减副词。不添加任何内容，因此我们可以将其删除。我们也得到了一些措辞，结果是。可以将其缩短为由于，在许多情况下，我们还会得到剪切或缩短，你可以经常说。你可能也听过那些不对吧？不是的结果。在@@医院里没被看见你可以听见这听起来有多尴尬，所以让我们试着把它们变成积极的方面。作为动词让我有点尴尬。在@@医院没被看见。这有点尴尬，所以让我们来改变一下。你实际上没有这里的上下文，所以要编辑这篇文章，你只需要退后一步，问问自己，作者想说什么？他们试图解释一个观察结果，即医院突然报告了更严重的伤害，而轻微的伤势却不那么轻微。他们告诉你的是，这种转变可能并不能反映现代重伤人数的真正增加，而是可能与轻伤患者有关，只是从未去过医院办理登机手续。而且，可能是为了省钱，医生决定不让较轻的病例住院。因此，我重写了这篇文章，因为受伤严重程度比例的变化可能反映了更严格的住院标准，而不是中度和重度伤害的真正增加。请注意，我已经摆脱了应该强调的是，笔记，尴尬的措辞，我将其归结为要点，即作者观察到的比例变化的可能解释。这是另一个。研究自闭症描述性流行病学的重要研究已经开始，包括随着时间的推移人口的患病率和特征的变化。好吧，这句话有什么问题？再次注意，主语和名字动词相距太远。这句话的主题是，研究。直到句子结尾处开始之前，我们才会谈到主动词。所以我们需要解决这个问题。再说一遍，看那些模糊的毛茸茸的词，比如“重要”。在这种情况下，听起来其他研究在说这些研究很重要，但这可能意味着还有其他研究并不重要。这也提出了一个问题，是什么让它们变得重要？谁在判断它们很重要？你所说的重要是什么意思？因此，请注意那些毛茸茸的词语。我们也明白了。随着时间的推移，这种情况会发生变化。你注意到了吗？这是多余的，因为您不能进行不随时间推移而进行的更改。顾名思义，变化总是会随着时间的推移而发生。因此，随着时间的推移而发生变化有点像成功的解决方案。就像我们上周看到的那样。最后是人口。这很模糊。除非你要指定特定的人群，否则人口的比例太模糊了。它不会添加任何东西，所以我们应该剪掉它。所以我把这篇文章编辑成，研究已经开始描述自闭症的流行病学，包括自闭症患病率和特征的最新变化。注意我已经把动词移到了句子里，已经开始了。我还将“研究描述性流行病学”浓缩为“描述流行病学”，注意那里动词的用法。我还去掉了“重要”然后删掉了“人口”，所以现在它干净得多，更直接。这是另一个例子。还有多种其他机制很重要，但人们怀疑其中大多数的影响很小，或者之所以重要，是因为对三种主要机制之一产生了影响。我们这里没有上下文，但你可以弄清楚。在上一句话中，作者一定谈到了三种主要机制，在这句话中，他们试图限定。还有其他机制在起作用，但不会对它们给予太多关注。这就是要点。让我们来看看我们可以编辑哪些内容。首先要注意的是，上周我告诉过你，你经常被淘汰。总共有。这是我们可以删除的例子之一，然后直接跳入其他多种机制。然后我们变得重要了。我之前已经告诉过你要注意那个毛茸茸的词。我们可以把这个词删掉“重要”。我们根本不需要它。从某种意义上说，“重要”一词实际上是矛盾的，因为作者一口气说其他机制很重要，但下一口气他们说，它们的影响很小。这两件事并不吻合，所以让我们再次删除“重要”一词。我还有什么办法摆脱这种无聊的动词，这里的“是”与其说多种机制是，我们可以说其他多种机制在起作用，起作用[听不清]然后我们开始了，其中大多数都被怀疑影响很小，太罗宋词了，被怀疑是不必要的冗长，这也是一个我们可能不在这里没有的对冲词。我们不需要进行套期保值。我们实际上是说它们的影响很小，因此没有必要进行套期保值。因此，我们可以说，还有其他多种机制，然后让我们深入研究并真正直截了当。其他多种机制只起着很小的作用。如果我们说只扮演一个小角色我们就能摆脱所有这些。Play，我们会把它改成只扮演一个小角色。或者之所以重要，是因为影响力和三种主要机制之一，我们可以稍微浓缩一下。我们可以说，其他多种机制的作用很小，或者通过影响三个主要机制中的一个来起作用。让我再次摆脱那个重要的东西，因为影响力。我们可以通过影响来工作，也可以通过影响来工作，这是三个主要机制之一。因此，现在这一切都归结为其他多种机制只能起到很小的作用或者通过影响三种主要机制之一来起作用。注意我们能在这里丢多少钱。请注意，我们没有因为摆脱那个套期保值而损失任何东西，据怀疑，我们真的不需要在里面进行套期保值。好的，这是另一个例子。在拒绝了信噪比较差的路径之后，我们剩下了678次波速测量，周期为7.5秒，对15秒波进行了891次测量。你可以听见这里有一些重复，有几件事我们可以摆脱。有一点是，我们明白了，在拒绝了信噪比差的路径之后，我认为我们可以稍微缩短一点。我只想说，拒绝信噪比差的路径给我们留下了麻烦。我们可以更直接一点然后说几句话。这确实使这个话题在这里有点长。但我实际上认为它在这种情况下行得通。然后，你拒绝他们这一事实留下了一定数量的衡量标准。我们可以稍微浓缩一下对测量结果的描述我们这里有一些重复，所以剩下678个速度城市测量值，比方说7.5秒的波。这稍短一点，所以7.5秒的波浪和891891个15秒的波浪。让我们去掉多余的测量值，我们已经说过测量了。因此，我们可以将其归结为拒绝路径，信噪比较差，剩下7.5秒波的678次速度测量和15秒波中的891次速度测量。好吧，这是下一个例子。人们怀疑，温度的重要性更多地与影响其他反应的速率有关，而不是作为消毒机制本身，因为池塘很少足够热，仅靠温度就能进行消毒。我们必须猜测一下这里的背景，但可能在前一句话中，作者告诉我们一些关于消毒池塘中温度的重要性的信息。现在，在这句话中，他们告诉我们，并不是说高温直接导致水沸腾，直接杀死微生物。不是热量直接杀死它们，而是消毒之所以发生，是因为温度升高会加速其他消毒反应。我实际上要重新整理这句话。首先，人们怀疑，又有这种套期保值。与其使用所有这些对冲词，不如说可能或可能，然后我们变得重要，这个词又很重要。温度的重要性。可能前一句话已经告诉我们温度很重要。所以我要把所有这一切都打掉。事实上，我要重新订购这个我最喜欢的部分是这里的结尾，上面写着，池塘很少足够热，光靠温度就能消毒。我喜欢直接进入这个解释。我们预计可能是温度本身导致消毒？而且他们马上就说不，事实并非如此。所以让我们从那种不错的直接开始，我要把它当作句子的开头。然后，我只想在最后再谈一谈这个想法以及这里的其余想法。所以我要说一个分号的池塘很少足够热，光靠温度就能消毒，现在让我们来解释其余的解释，因此，温度的影响很可能是介导的，因为它对其他反应速率的影响。温度的影响也可能是中介的，我喜欢这个词，中介，它让人想到它很可能是介导的，这是一个不错的动词。然后我们可以通过费率来做其他反应，然后我们可以摆脱所有这些，我就把完整的编辑放在这里，而不必把整件事写出来。因此，池塘很少足够热，仅靠温度就能进行消毒。因此，温度的影响很可能是通过其对其他反应速率的影响来介导的。最后，再举一个练习示例。这实际上是摘要的最后一句话，所以作者想告诉你他们的结论是什么。这有点难以理解，因为他们说这是假设的，这实际上是间接的。我们得出结论，我们宁愿有类似的东西。据推测，这令人困惑。我们可以在这里剪掉很多东西，人们认为显然我们想把它们全部清除，这简直令人困惑。然后我们之所以能做到这一点，是因为下肢关节的工作量减少了，假肢的能量损失减少了。让我们更直接地说，作者想说的是，假肢的效果是他们在论文中发现的Covered。与健康的脚踝相比，它似乎可以减少小腿关节的工作量，减少小腿关节的能量损失。因此，让我们重新排列一下，直接说出来，这样我们就可以说“假肢”，然后我们要说“减少”，因为这是他们要解释的观察结果。假肢可以减少工作量和能量损失我们不需要重复下肢两次。与健康的脚踝关节相比，可以减少工作量和能量损失。而且我要去掉“复杂”这个词。我们不需要健康的脚踝关节复合体。比方说，与健康的脚踝关节相比，我实际上要摆脱这个问题，最后我会把它浓缩起来。所以我们要说的是，与之相比，脚踝关节健康。然后，报纸上的观察使他们开始猜测某件事。我们要把猜测放在最后，所以我只想把这个问题放在最后。我要补充一点。有点像用简短的形式总结这句话的其余部分，这可能会导致在最大冲刺期间分层代谢成本。我不打算把它写出来，我只想在这里给你看最后的编辑内容。因此，与健康的脚踝关节相比，我们首先直接进行假体日志可以减少工作量和能量损失。然后，这一观察使作者相信，在最长冲刺期间，这可能会降低新陈代谢成本。