In this next module, we're going to edit two paragraphs. I’m going to lay out the logical structure of the paragraphs, and use that logical structure to help guide my editing. I’m actually going to write out formal outlines for the logical structure of each paragraph. I don't normally do that in my writing and editing, but I think it will be helpful here to explicitly, write out the logical structure using formal outlines.

Here’s the first example. This is from a published scientific paper. In the paper, scientists had had participants smell a bunch of different perfume sense in the laboratory, and rate them on a sliding scale from zero to ten, where ten means you really liked the scent. Then they measured the participants' genes, and they tried to determine whether a person's preference for various sense correlates with their genetics. So that was the experiment. I pulled this paragraph from the limitation section of that paper, and now I want you to take a moment and pause the video and read this paragraph on your own, and then restart the video.

The point of this paragraph is that the others are addressing a concern about the choice of the concentration for the perfume sense in their experiment. it's so intense and overpowering that most people will just be turned off to that cent So you don't want to put everything at too high of a concentration. In this paragraph, they're trying to convince the reader that they chose the right concentrations because one, they standardized to a reference’s substance, and two, they got a reasonable amount of variation in the participants' preferences for the sense, suggesting that none of the sense were universally overpowering. I want to point out a few things about this paragraph. Notice all the sentences that begin with transition words. We have nevertheless hence, however, interestingly so, there's a lot of telling the reader, hey, I'm going here, I'm going there. If you need to keep telling the reader where you're going, this usually indicates problems with the underlying logic.

Another quick thing I want to point out is that I notice the spelling error in the paragraph. This is the kind of spelling error that your word processing program might feel to pick up. It says the final concentrations were in principle. This is the wrong principle. Remember, principle ends in P-A-L pal. And that's how you can remember that this principle means the principal of a school, because the principal is your pal. What the authors actually wanted here was principal ending in P-L-E, not the principal of a school, but a principle, as in a fundamental tenet.

One thing I want to point out in the spare raft is that the authors stuck some extra thoughts inside of parentheses. Interestingly, I really liked the stuff that was in the parentheses. That was where the authors were being most clear. Simple and direct. They clarify for the reader, meaning that people can decide whether they liked assent or not. Ah, as soon as they say it so blamelessly. Now I get it, and we get people agreed largely on the quality of these 2 scents. Again, everything suddenly becomes clear and simple when you put it that way. So I'm going to try to take this clear and simple language and get it out of the parentheses, and have the rest of the paragraph, uh, read more like this.

When I edit a paragraph like this, I start by approaching it from a high level. I take a big picture view. I just try to figure out, what is it that the authors were trying to say? Now, I don't actually usually write out a formal outline. I usually just do this in my head, but I wanted to write it down here to make it very explicit. I believe that the main idea of this paragraph is to address potential criticisms about the choice of perfume concentration. The authors are writing about this in the limitation section of their manuscript. They’re basically just trying to answer the question Were the perfume concentrations in the experiment appropriate?

The first point they bring up is they address the issue about concentration. If concentrations are too high, a smell can become too intense, in too overpowering, and it might be universe uniformly aversive just because of this, so we have to worry about very high concentrations. They defend their experiment against this potential pitfall by noticing that they standardized the intensity, so they're saying it shouldn't be a problem here.

The second major point they make is that one way to tell whether or not the concentrations were appropriate is to look at how much variation there is in participant preference. Presumably, if they got the concentrations right, there'd be a wide variation in participant preference. It wouldn't be like all the participants hated the scent because it was too overpowering.

And the author say, hey, this appeared to be true. We got good variation for most sense, up with two exceptions. So those are the main points that the authors were trying to convey. The goal of my, editing is going to be to bring out all of those main ideas in simple language. I want to get rid of, everything that doesn't contribute to those main ideas. Using this outline. It makes it a lot easier to do a good at it. So I went ahead and I edited this down to the following. I reduced it from 212 words to 91 words. It reads **Perfume intensity and quality are negatively correlated at high concentrations. If the cent is too strong, people will rate it unfavorably. Hence, we chose the final concentrations of each perfume ingredient so that it had similar intensity to our reference. The resulting concentrations appear appropriate for most sense, as participants' preferences varied along the sliding scale between zero and ten. However, participants largely agreed on Bergamot and Vetiver, so lower or higher concentrations may have been needed for these** **scents**.

You can see that I have edited this down to match my outline. I get across just those key points, and I remove all the clutter that's detracting from those key points. And you can check back to the outline and make sure that we hit all of these main points. You’ll see that it matches very closely. Again, I don't expect you to write out formal outlines like this, but you need to think through the logic this carefully in your head.

All right, one more example that we can edit. I’m this one's a little bit easier to understand, but I'm going to ask you again to pause the video, read it through on your own, and then restart the video.

Okay, I think this one's a little bit easier to follow than an example. It’s basically just a compare contrast, comparing classic epidemiology to clinical epidemiology.

So I went ahead and made a formal outline. I think the main idea of the paragraph is just to say that classic and clinical epidemiology differs. Going to tell you how they differ. And then they have to say, what is classic epidemiology and what is clinical epidemiology? They're going to point out, again, it's a compare contrast. They’re going to point out the differences between those two things. And then within each of those, uh they used a word that might need a definition. So in talking about classic epidemiology, they use the word Etiology. In talking about clinical epidemiology, they used the word prognosis. And the author felt like, uh, they needed to define those words for the reader. So it's a pretty simple structure that we at have here. And what I'm going to do for this example is actually, I'm going to go through and do some sentence level editing now for you as well as we try to edit this down and get just to these main ideas.

All right, so for this example, I'm going to walk you through my sentence level editing. Will start with the first sentence. **Although the methodological approaches are similar, the questions posed in classic epidemiology and clinical epidemiology are different.** You can hear the wordiness here. So we can get rid of some of this wordiness. We could just say, uh, I think we can get rid of all of this. How about we just say, despite similarities, that captures all of everything that's in there, despite similarities, I don't think we need to say the questions pose. That’s very wordy. How about we just say, despite similarities, classic epidemiology and clinical epidemiology are different, and we can do a little better than our different We can just say they differ. And if we want to get that idea of differing about questions, we could say they differ in aim that's my putting back the questions posed part, so we can edit that down to despite methodological similarities, classic epidemiology and clinical epidemiology differ in aim And we've hit now the main idea of the paragraph.

Alight In the next few sentences, I want to point out that the authors have used parallel sentence structure across multiple sentences. This is great. They just need to bring it out a bit more. Notice the structure. Here they say, in classic epidemiology, epidemiologists pose a question about the Etiology of a disease in a population of people. Later on, we get something very similar. In clinical epidemiology, clinicians pose a question about the prognosis of a disease in a population of patients. Notice the parallel structure. What we get is in discipline, one group, one poses a question about uh X in a population of people. And that's very similar to what we get later. We get some interim garbage here. But then we get to in discipline too. Group two poses a question about why in, a population of patients. So we have this nice parallel structure that's going to help with paragraph flow. And notice there is a transition phrase here on the other hand, we don't really need that transition phrase, because we can use the parallel’s structure to help with flow. We’re just going to need to bring it out a bit.

So I'm going to do my sentence level editing now. On these few sentences um, I'm going to change this and say, make it a little bit shorter by saying, classic epidemiologists pose a question about the Etiology of a disease in a population of people. I am going to get rid of all this stuff about the causal associations for now, because I want to get right to that parallel sentence. And later I'll put back in a little definition of Etiology, but we can do it much more quickly then I'm going to remove On the other hand, we don't need that transition anymore, because we have these this nice parallel set up. And then I am going to say, uh, in clinical epidemiology again, I'll change that to clinical epidemiologists. They remain parallel with the first sentence. Clinical epidemiologists pose a question about the prognosis of a disease in a population of patients.

So that reduces nicely down to this nice, uh, shorter version. Classic epidemiologists pose a question about the Etiology of a disease and a population of people. Clinical epidemiologists pose a question about the prognosis of a disease in a population of patients. We get that nice parallel structure, and we've hit A and B on the outline now we compared in contrasted clinical to classical epidemiology.

All right, one more sentence to go here. That last sentence was just a definition of prognosis. You can see that there's a lot that can be cut in this sentence. So we get prognosis can be regarded as, uh, we can just say is instead of, can be regarded as then we get a set of outcomes and their associated probabilities following the occurrence of This is all very worthy. I’m just going to change this to Prognosis is the probability, the probability that an event, that an event or diagnosis, will result in a particular outcome. So I've trimmed this up quite a bit, get rid of a lot of this wordiness. So prognosis is the probability that, um, an event or diagnosis will result in a particular outcome. I think that's it in a nutshell. And now we've hid upon the definition of prognosis, which was that final point in the outline.

So altogether, you'll notice that I did put in the little definition of Etiology. I just slipped it in after a semicolon. So we get a despite methiodal logic similarities, classic epidemiology and clinical epidemiology, different name. Classic epidemiologists pose a question about the Etiology of disease in a population of people. And here I'm slipping in the definition of Etiology. Etiologic factors can be can be manipulated to prevent disease. Clinical epidemiologists pose a question about the prognosis of a disease in a population of patients, and then I get flipping the definition of prognosis. Prognosis is the probability that an event or diagnosis will result in a particular outcome.

And I have cut this down from 111 words down to 65. And you can check back with the outline, and you can see that I've hit all the main points on the outline.

在下一个模块中，我们将编辑两个段落。我将对段落的逻辑结构进行布局，并使用该逻辑结构来指导我的编辑。实际上，我要为每个段落的逻辑结构写出正式的大纲。我通常不会在写作和编辑时这样做。但我认为，这里使用正式大纲明确写出逻辑结构会很有帮助。这是第一个例子。这来自一篇已发表的科学论文。在论文中，科学家们让参与者在实验室里闻到一堆不同的香水气味，并按从零到十的滑动比例对它们进行评分，其中十表示你真的很喜欢这种气味。然后，他们测量参与者的基因，并试图确定一个人对各种感官的偏好是否与他们的遗传学相关。所以这就是实验。我从那篇论文的限制部分中提取了这段话。现在我想让你花点时间暂停视频然后自己阅读这段话，然后重启视频。本段的重点是，作者在实验中解决了对香水气味浓度选择的担忧。事实证明，当一种气味的浓度非常高时，它就会变得如此强烈和强烈，以至于大多数人会被这种气味拒之门外。因此，你不想把所有东西都集中得太高。在本段中，他们试图说服读者相信他们选择了正确的浓度。因为，第一，它们标准化为参考物质。第二，参与者对气味的偏好存在合理的差异，这表明没有一种气味是普遍压倒性的。我想指出有关本段的几点内容。请注意所有以过渡词开头的句子。但是，有趣的是，我们确实如此。所以有很多话要告诉读者嘿，我要去这里，我要去那里。如果你需要继续告诉读者你要去哪里，这通常表明底层逻辑存在问题。我想指出的另一件简短的事情是，我注意到段落中有拼写错误。这是您的文字处理程序可能无法识别的那种拼写错误。它说最终的浓度是原则上的，这是错误的原则。请记住，校长以P-A-L结尾，伙计，这就是你记住这个校长的意思是学校的校长，因为校长是你的朋友。作者在这里真正想要的是原则，以P-L-E结尾。不是学校的校长，而是基本原则中的原则。我想在本段中指出的一件事是，作者在括号内加了一些额外的想法。有趣的是，我真的很喜欢括号中的内容。那是作者最清晰、最简单、最直接的地方。它们向读者澄清，这意味着人们可以决定自己是否喜欢某种气味。他们一这么直言不讳地说出来，现在，我就明白了。我们明白了，人们基本上同意这两种气味的质量。再说一遍，当你这样说时，一切都会突然变得清晰而简单。因此，我将尝试使用这种清晰而简单的语言并将其从括号中删除，然后让段落的其余部分更多地这样阅读。当我编辑这样的段落时，我首先要从高层次来看待它。我拍的是大图。我只是想弄清楚，作者想说什么？现在，我通常不写出正式的大纲。我通常只是在脑海里这样做。但是我想把它写在上面，让它非常明确。我认为，本段的主要思想是解决对香水浓度选择的潜在批评。作者在菜单脚本的限制部分写了这篇文章，他们基本上只是想回答这个问题，实验中的香水浓度是否合适？他们提出的第一点是他们解决了注意力问题。如果浓度过高，气味可能会变得过于强烈和过于强烈。仅仅因为这个，它可能一直是厌恶的。因此，我们必须担心浓度过高。他们注意到自己标准化了强度，从而捍卫自己的实验免受这种潜在的陷阱。所以他们说这应该不是问题。他们提出的第二个要点是，判断浓度是否合适的一种方法是看看参与者的偏好有多大差异。据推测，如果他们的浓度正确，参与者的偏好就会有很大的差异。这不会像所有参与者都讨厌这个结局，因为它太压倒性了，作者说，嘿，这似乎是真的。对于大多数气味，我们都有不错的变化，但有两个例外。因此，这些是作者试图传达的要点。我编辑的目标是用简单的语言表达所有这些主要想法。我想把所有对这些主要想法没有贡献的东西都清理掉。使用此大纲，可以更轻松地进行良好的编辑。所以我想继续前进，我把它编辑成了以下内容。我把它从212个字减少到91个字。它显示，在高浓度下，香水的强度和质量呈负相关。如果气味太浓了，人们会给它打不利的评价。因此，我们选择了每种香水成分的最终浓度，使其浓度与参考气味相似。由此产生的浓度似乎适合大多数气味。由于参与者的偏好随0到10之间的滑动比例而变化。但是，参与者在很大程度上同意佛手柑和香根草，因此这些气味可能需要更低或更高的浓度。你可以看到我已经把它编辑下来以匹配我的大纲。我只想到了这些关键点，然后我消除了所有减损这些关键点的混乱局面。你可以回过头来查看大纲，确保我们达到了所有这些要点。你会发现它非常匹配。再说一遍，我不希望你写出这样的正式大纲，但你需要在脑海中仔细思考逻辑。好吧，还有一个我们可以编辑的例子。这个更容易理解。但是我要再次请你暂停视频，自己通读，然后重启视频。好吧，我认为这个比上一个例子更容易理解。它基本上只是比较经典流行病学和临床流行病学的比较/对比。于是我继续做了一个正式的大纲。我认为该段的主要思想只是说经典流行病学和临床流行病学有所不同。它会告诉你它们有何不同。然后，他们必须说什么是经典流行病学，什么是临床流行病学。再说一遍，这是一种比较和对比，他们将指出这两件事之间的区别。然后，在每个词中，他们都使用了一个可能需要定义的词，所以在谈论经典的流行病学时，他们使用了病因学这个词，在谈论临床流行病学时，他们使用了预后这个词。作者觉得他们需要向读者定义这些词。因此，这是一个非常简单的结构，我们在这里。在这个例子中，我要做的是，我现在也要为你做一些句子级别的编辑。当我们尝试将其编辑下来时，只想了解这些主要想法。因此，在本例中，我将引导你完成句子级别的编辑。我们将从第一句话开始。尽管方法论相似，但经典流行病学和临床流行病学中提出的问题却有所不同。你可以听到这里的措辞，这样我们就可以去掉一些措辞。我想我们可以说把所有这一切都清理掉。尽管有相似之处，但我们只是说怎么样。尽管有相似之处，但它还是捕捉了里面的所有东西。我认为我们不需要说出所提出的问题，这太罗词了。我们只是说，尽管有相似之处，但经典的流行病学和临床流行病学是不同的，我们可以做得比不同更好一点。我们可以说它们有所不同。而且，如果我们想对问题有不同的看法，我们可以说他们的目标不同。那是我把提出的问题放回原来的部分。因此，我们可以将其编辑为尽管方法相似，但经典流行病学和临床流行病学的目标却有所不同。现在我们已经了解了这段话的主要思想。好吧，在接下来的几句话中，我想指出的是，作者在多个句子中使用了平行的句子结构。这太棒了，他们只需要再把它拿出来一点就行了。请注意这里的结构。他们说，在经典的流行病学中，流行病学家对人群中疾病的病因提出了一个问题。稍后，我们得到了非常相似的东西。在临床流行病学中，临床医生提出了一个关于患者群体中疾病预后的问题。请注意，平行结构，我们得到的是学科1，第1组，它对人群中的X提出了一个问题，这与我们稍后得到的非常相似。我们这里有一些临时垃圾，但随后我们进入了第2学科，第2组，提出了一个关于患者群体中Y的问题。因此，我们有这个漂亮的平行结构，可以帮助实现段落流动。另一方面，请注意这里有一个过渡短语。我们真的不需要那个过渡短语，因为我们可以使用并行结构来帮助流动。我们只需要再把它拿出来一点。因此，我现在要对这几句话进行句子级别的编辑。我要改变一下然后说，把它缩短一点，说，经典的流行病学家对人群中一种疾病的病因提出一个问题。我现在要把所有这些关于因果关联的东西都删掉，因为我想直接说出那句平行的句子。稍后，我将重新介绍一下病因学的定义，但我们可以更快地做到这一点。然后，我要移除，另一方面，我们不再需要这种过渡了。因为我们有这个漂亮的平行设置，然后我要说，在临床流行病学中，再说一遍，我会把它改成临床流行病学家。这与第一句话相似，临床流行病学家对患者群体中疾病的预后提出了一个问题。因此，这可以很好地简化为这个漂亮、更短的版本。经典流行病学家提出了一个关于人群中疾病的病因的问题。临床流行病学家提出了一个关于患者群体中疾病预后的问题。我们得到了那种漂亮的平行结构，现在我们在大纲上找到了A和B，我们已经将临床流行病学与经典流行病学进行了比较和对比。好吧，再说一句话。最后一句话只是预后的定义。你可以看到，这句话中有很多可以删掉的内容。所以我们得到的预后可以被视为，我们可以说是而不是可以被视为。然后，我们得到一组结果及其在发生后的相关概率，这一切都非常冗长。我只想把它改为，预后就是概率。事件或诊断导致特定结果的概率。所以我已经把它修剪了很多。然后去掉很多这样的措辞。因此，预后是事件或诊断导致特定结果的概率。简而言之，我想就是这样，现在我想我们已经确定了预后的定义，这是大纲中的最后一点。总而言之，你会注意到我确实对病因学做了一点定义，我只是在分号之后才把它放进去，所以尽管方法相似，但经典的流行病学和临床流行病学的目标却有所不同。经典流行病学家对人群中疾病的病因提出了一个问题，在这里，我对流行病学的定义不屑一顾。可以控制病因来预防疾病。临床流行病学家对患者群体中疾病的预后提出了一个问题，然后我开始改变预后的定义，预后是事件或诊断导致特定结果的可能性。我已经把这个词从111个字减少到65个字。你可以用大纲回来看看，你可以看到，我已经触及了大纲上的所有要点。