

## 第 5 章 论文修改示例

---

论文初稿完成后,应该回过头来仔细阅读,重点检查论文的内容、格式及语法是否有不妥当的地方,论文的某些部分可能需要做较大的改动,甚至重写。修改论文时,手头最好有一些写作规范参考书及英语用法指南,以便随时翻阅并参考正确的用法。检查和修改的重点是:

- 尽量将被动语态的句子转换成主动语态。
- 尽量将复杂的词汇用较简单的词汇代替。
- 尽量将复杂的句子用较简单的句子代替,将长句分成 2 到 3 个较短的句子。
- 确认对所有假设条件都已给出合理的解释。
- 确认所有信息都已按逻辑顺序表达清楚。
- 确认所有引用他人资源的地方都已标明出处。

修改论文应该从摘要开始,这是评委首先阅读的内容,应逐字逐句仔细修改。除上述检查项目以外,需要检查摘要是否包含了所有要点以及是否在逻辑上表述清楚。如果仍不理想,应该考虑重新组织摘要的逻辑结构,以更易于阅读和理解。

接下来将论文快速浏览一遍,确定所有已经强调的地方(各节标题、数学表达式、表格、图形以及用黑体书写的句子)确实能够快速帮助读者了解论文所讨论的问题,同时没有强调不该强调的内容。

最后检查论文的全文。由于时间限制,检查全文时可能做不到像检查摘要那样仔细,但检查的重点都是一样的。

本章以往届 MCM 竞赛中中国学生提交的论文为例,详细介绍如何修改论文的标题、摘要、引言及假设条件。

### 1 示例:如何修改标题

2010 年的 MCM 竞赛中有一道赛题,要求参赛小组找出棒球棍上的最佳击球点。提交的论文中有一篇题为“Science in Sweet Spot”的论文<sup>[12]</sup>,本节以这篇论文为例介绍如何修改论文的标题。

论文的标题需要认真推敲。这篇论文的标题有以下 3 处错误:

- (1) 介词使用不当。在这个标题中,最好使用介词 of 而不是 in。
- (2) 单数可数名词 spot 前没有加冠词。这篇论文讨论的最佳击球点是特定的点,所以应该加定冠词 the。
- (3) 关于名词 science。这篇论文研究的不是一般性的科学,而是关于最佳击球点的特定的科学,所以需要加定冠词 the。

综上所述,这篇论文标题的正确写法应该是: The Science of the Sweet Spot。

## 2 示例: 如何修改摘要

摘要虽然不长,但却需要用较长的时间思考和写作。写摘要所花的时间与论文其他部分相比往往会长很多,这是正常的。同样,修改摘要的时间相比修改其他部分也要长很多。在保证重要内容前提下,应该尽可能将摘要写得精练一些。

仍以上节提到的题为“Science in Sweet Spot”的论文<sup>[12]</sup>为例,其摘要如下:

This paper mainly studies the “sweet spot” on a baseball bat. Firstly, by analyzing the video of a professional hitter, a double-pivot swing (the arm and the finesse) model is established to describe a batter hitting a baseball. Then based on the law of energy conservation, the double-pivot swing model is further transferred into a single-pivot swing model. With the given shape of the bat and the parameters for the single-pivot swing model, the moment of inertia of a wooden bat, corked bat and aluminum bat is calculated, respectively. By the law of kinetic energy conservation, hitting a baseball at different spots of the bat can be seen as an imperfect elastic collision of two balls. Thus given a bat, for different speeds of the coming ball and that of swinging the bat, the speed of the hitting ball can be calculated according to the Newton's collision law.

修改如下:

- (1) *This paper mainly studies the “sweet spot” on a baseball bat.*

用“This paper”为主语作为摘要的开篇,会把作者和读者都视为论文之外的旁观者。因为论文描述的是作者自己的工作,所以应该用 We 做主语。论文中除了研究最佳击球点之外还会涉及其他内容,所以在这里用 mainly 这个词没有必要,应该删去。最后,“sweet spot”是棒球棍上最佳击球位置的标准说法,除非论文作者觉得这个名称不合适,否则不应该用引号把它括起来。因此,可将摘要的第一句话修改为

We study the sweet spot on a baseball bat.

改写后的句子不但简洁,而且生动有力。同年的竞赛有一篇题为“The Sweet Spot: A Wave Model of Baseball Bats”的优胜论文,其摘要的第一句话就是

We determine the sweet spot on a baseball bat.

- (2) *Firstly, by analyzing the video of a professional hitter, a double-pivot swing (the arm and the finesse) model is established to describe a batter hitting a baseball.*

这个句子是被动语态,应该把它改为主动语态。与第一句话一样,这句话也忽视了作者和读者,只站在第三者的立场上说论文分析了视频并建立了模型。有关职业击球手的视频很多,作者没有指明是哪个视频,所以应该将 video 前的定冠词(至少在第一次出现的时候)改为不定冠词,即将“the video”改成“a video”。最后,firstly 这个词在现代英语中已近很少有人用了,大多数美国人认为这是一个已经过时的词。因此,尽管用“firstly”没有语法错误,但还是不用为好,或将 firstly 改为 first。这个句子可以改写为

We begin by establishing a model of a bat hitting a ball by analyzing a video of a professional hitter.

- (3) *Then based on the law of energy conservation, the double-pivot swing model is further transferred into a single-pivot swing model.*

这句话是被动语态,应改写为主动语态。

- (4) *With the given shape of the bat and the parameters for the single-pivot swing model, the moment of inertia of a wooden bat, corked bat and aluminum bat is calculated, respectively.*

这是摘要第一次且唯一一次提到棒球棍的形状;同样,也是第一次且唯一一次提到参数。这些内容都不应该在摘要中出现。棒球棍的形状及参数是在建模时使用的,所以可以把这部分的内容改写成“Using our model...”。在摘要中也没有必要把棒球棍的材料细分为木制的、软木的或是铝制的。

前面曾经说过,在修改论文时,除了逐字逐句地修改外,必要时需要对论文做大幅度的改动。这篇论文的摘要想要表达的意思是,用棒球棍击球与用球击球的效果是相同的,作者稍后将其称为“hitting ball”。可以将摘要改写为

We study the sweet spot on a baseball bat. We begin by establishing a model of a bat hitting a ball by analyzing a video of a professional hitter. Using this model, we determine that hitting a ball with a bat can

be seen as an imperfect collision of two balls, where the bat is replaced by a “hitting ball”.

### 3 示例：如何修改引言

在 2008 年的 MCM 竞赛中有一道赛题，要求参赛小组设计一个算法，自动产生不同难度的数独游戏。在提交的参赛论文中有一篇题为 “The Solvers’ Sudoku or computers’ Sudoku” 的论文<sup>[13]</sup>。本节以这篇论文为例讲解如何修改引言。可以看到，这篇论文的标题含有两个错误，第一是 “computer” 中的 “c” 应该大写，第二是要加定冠词 “the”，所以这篇文章的题目应为 “The Solver’s Sudoku or the Computer’s Sudoku”。

这篇论文的引言如下：

Sudoku (Japanese: *sūdoku*) is derived from Switzerland, developed in America and carried forward in Japan. It is a simple game of logic and so easy to learn. It is also a fun and addictive game and is puzzling millions of players all over the world. Many people like it. Partial people began to study solving the puzzles by computer. However, generating Sudoku puzzles is even more difficult when difficulty levels and a unique solution both are considered. It is also the task we are required to finish.

The aim is to create a reliable sudoku algorithm which has least complexity and a unique solution should be guaranteed. Difficulty levels are greatly depended on the metrics developed. The basic thought is that we delete digits from a solved puzzle, and then check out if there is a unique solution. Develop a series of metrics to define the the difficulty levels. Judge its difficulty level utilizing metrics.

Metrics are very important in the whole course of constructing puzzles. In our paper, we develop metrics fit for persons’ thought and metrics aimed at computers’ “thought” respectively. The former is subjective and the latter is impersonal.

修改如下：

- (1) *Sudoku (Japanese: *sūdoku*) is derived from Switzerland, developed in America and carried forward in Japan.*

这句话尽管读起来很上口，但句子中的动词排比却不一致：is derived, developed 及 carried forward 这 3 个动词的句式结构都不相同。而且，“is derived from

Switzerland”的意思是，数独游戏是从瑞士这个国家转变而来的，用“originated in”会更加准确。

如果数独游戏不是众所周知的游戏，则应该在引言中首先简要介绍一下什么是数独游戏。这篇论文的作者假定了数独游戏是读者熟知的游戏，这是正确的。

(2) *It is a simple game of logic and so easy to learn.*

这句话中的“so easy”是习惯用语，与“very easy”同义。作者也许想用so来表示后半句话是由前半句话导出的结论，用“hence easy to learn”或“so it is easy to learn”能够更清楚地表达这层逻辑关系。

(3) *It is also a fun and addictive game and is puzzling millions of players all over the world. Many people like it.*

前面的句子和这个句子都以“It is ...”作为句子的开头，读起来很单调。此外，既然这是个很有趣的游戏，并有数以百万计的人玩过这个游戏，因此可以假设很多人都喜欢这个游戏，所以最后一句话是多余的。

(4) *Partial people began to study solving the puzzles by computer.*

这是一个让人感到毛骨悚然的句子，因为“partial people”指的是部分是人的怪物。作者可能想说的是有些人开始用计算机来解答数独游戏。

(5) *However, generating Sudoku puzzles is even more difficult when difficulty levels and a unique solution both are considered.*

这句话和上句话的衔接不连贯。However是转折词，可以用来指出设计数独游戏的难度与做某件事情的难度相反，但从这句话中看不出数独游戏在与什么做比较。而且这句话也没有说清楚是跟什么进行比较会even more difficult。还有一点是，两个相似的单词difficult和difficulty不应该放在如此接近的地方使用。

(6) *It is also the task we are required to finish.*

这句话应改为主动语态。

(7) *The aim is to create a reliable sudoku algorithm which has least complexity and a unique solution should be guaranteed.*

作者应该把自己和读者融入到这句话中，即以“Our aim ...”作主语。此外，“sudoku algorithm”是指设计数独游戏的算法，还是指为数独游戏寻找解答的算法，上下文没有说明。尽管读者或许能猜到它指的是设计数独游戏的算法，但作者应当明确地将这个意思表达出来。短语“has least complexity”可以简写为“is simplest”。最后，应把“a unique solution should be guaranteed”改为主动语态。

- (8) *Difficulty levels are greatly depended on the metrics developed.*

应将“depended on”改写为“dependent on”。度量标准(metrics)在引言里是首次出现,但是给人的感觉是读者已经非常熟悉它了。所以应该在这句话之前解释什么是 metrics,或者表明是在这里引入 metrics。

- (9) *The basic thought is that we delete digits from a solved puzzle, and then check out if there is a unique solution.*

作者没有指出谁在思考,所以这个句子最好以“Our basic thought...”开头。实际上,作者想要表达的是他们正在做什么,因此用“Our approach...”会更合适。

- (10) *Develop a series of metrics to define the difficulty level. Judge its difficulty level utilizing metrics.*

这是两个不完整的句子。作者也许是想在第一个句子中列出他们在解题中用到的度量标准。如果是这样的话,应该将这些度量标准用列表的形式写出来。这两个句子不是平行的,所以需要完整的句子分别加以描述。

- (11) *Metrics are very important in the whole course of constructing puzzles.*

如果有些东西很重要,但是它的重要性不容易被读者理解,则作者需要解释为什么这些东西很重要。诸如“X is important”这种形式的句子基本上都是不必要的,应该删掉。

- (12) *In our paper, we develop metrics fit for persons' thought and metrics aimed at computers' "thought" respectively.*

引言肯定是针对目前这篇论文的,所以“in our paper”是多余的,应当删除。因为没有对两个列表做比较,所以这句话不应当以 respectively 结尾。最后,两次出现的单词 thought 都应该用复数形式 thoughts。

根据以上的分析,可将这个引言改写如下:

Sudoku, originated in Switzerland, was developed in America and popularized in Japan. It is easy to learn, and millions of players enjoy being puzzled by it. While some players have created algorithms to solve sudoku puzzles, our task is to create an algorithm to generate sudoku puzzles of various difficulty levels with unique solutions.

Since our task involves measuring the difficulty of the puzzles our algorithm generates, we develop a series of metrics to define and measure the difficulty. We create metrics to measure the difficulty of a puzzle for a person and metrics to measure the difficulty of a puzzle for a computer.

Our approach is to

- start with an already solved puzzle;
- delete some digits;
- check to see if there is a unique solution;
- measure the difficulty level.

## 4 示例：如何修改假设条件

2011 年的 MCM 竞赛中有一道赛题，要求参赛小组对汽油驱动的常规汽车和电动汽车的性能做比较。在提交的参赛论文中有一篇题为 “Can Electric Vehicle Be Widely Used” 的论文<sup>[14]</sup>，本节以这篇论文为例讲解如何修改假设条件。

需要指出的是，这篇论文的标题有错。因为论文讨论的不是一辆汽车，所以标题应该改为 “Can Electric Vehicles Be Widely Used”。如果作者考虑的是整类电动汽车，则应该把 “electric vehicle” 改为 “the electric vehicle”，因而标题应该改为 “Can the Electric Vehicle Be Widely Used”。

这篇论文讨论了三种类型的汽车，即常规汽车 (CV)、电动汽车 (EV) 及混合型电动汽车 (HEV)。论文的第 2 节列出了作者需要用到的所有假设条件，并用编号列表的形式列出如下：

1. We will select one vehicle mode to represent CV, EV and HEV.
2. We assume there is no difference in performance of each vehicle type.
3. We select France, USA, and China to represent European countries, American countries and Asian countries.
4. We assume performance of CV, EV and HEV will not change in the future.
5. Based on common sense, we assume each vehicle travels 10,000 km every year.
6. We will not specify different types of power plants and assume that each plant will generate 10,000,000 kwh annually on average.
7. We do not consider the dissipation during energy conversion.

但这些假设合理与否，论文没有给出任何解释。

修改如下：

- (1) *We will select one vehicle model to represent CV, EV and HEV.*

这里作者其实是想说 “vehicle model”，不是 “vehicle mode”。这句话读起来的感觉是，作者要用一种车型代表三类不同类型的汽车。但其实作者想表达的是，每种类型的汽车都将用不同的车型来代表。实际上读到论文的最后才会

发现,选择一种车型代表一类汽车是参赛小组解题方法中的一部分,不是假设条件。

- (2) *We assume there is no difference in performance of each vehicle type.*

单词 Performance (性能) 有很多种解释,所以应该在文中明确指出是何种性能。同时,虽然参赛小组的原意是想说所有常规汽车的性能类似,所有电动汽车的性能类似,以及所有混合型电动汽车的性能也类似。但所写的句子却可以解释为所有常规汽车和电动汽车的性能类似,并且和混合型电动汽车的性能类似。然而这两种解释都是不合理的,任意一种解释都要求作者说明为什么做此假设。其实在这里所做的假设都只是为了将问题简化,应该明确指出这一点。如果作者有证据支持这个假设的合理性,则应该写清楚。

- (3) *We select France, USA, and China to represent European countries, American countries and Asian countries.*

参赛小组并不是想表达所选的每一个国家都可以代表所有的洲,而是可以代表其所在的洲,所以这句话的结尾应该加上 *respectively* 来表明这种关系。此外,这句话其实并不是假设,而是作者建模的方法。如果作者有证据支持这样的选择是合理的,即所选的国家确实能够代表其所在的洲,则应该在列出假设后将这些证据写清楚。

- (4) *We assume performance of CV, EV and HEV will not change in the future.*

根据目前科技发展的速度,这个假设很可能是错误的。这个简化假设也许很必要,但作者必须将这点明确交代清楚。

- (5) *Based on common sense, we assume each vehicle travels 10,000 km every year.*

读者不能根据常理推断每辆车每年行驶的里程数是 10 000 km,所以应该明确指出这只是一个为简化问题所做的假设,或者提供支持这个里程数的证据。

- (6) *We will not specify different types of power plants and assume that each plant will generate 10,000,000 kwh annually on average.*

做这个假设的依据是什么? 需要提供证据支持这个假设的合理性。

- (7) *We do not consider the dissipation during energy conversion.*

这句话读起来不像是假设。假设的写法应该是“*There is no dissipation during energy conversion*”。由于这不是一种合理的假设,所以作者必须明确指出这是一个必要的简化条件,并在讨论模型的弱点时应该把这个假设提出来讨论。

根据以上的讨论,可将假设部分改写如下:

We will choose the 2010 Ford Focus 1.4 Duratec to represent conven-



tional vehicles, the Tesla Roadster to represent electric vehicles, and the Chevrolet Volt to represent hybrid-electric vehicles. We will also choose France as a representative European country, the USA as a representative American country, and China as a representative Asian country.

We will make the following simplifying assumptions.

1. Each car we chose is typical of its class.
2. Vehicle performance will not change in the future.
3. Each vehicle will travel 10,000 km per year.
4. Each country we chose is typical of its continent.
5. Each power plant will generate an average of 10,000,000 kwh per year.
6. There is no energy dissipation during energy conversion.

此外，参赛小组应该阐明 performance 在这篇论文中的含义。如果参赛小组可以提供证据支持某些假设的合理性，则应该用新的列表列出这些假设，并给出合理性依据。最后，对所有为了简化问题而提出的假设，都应该在讨论模型缺陷时予以讨论。

