Analysis of A New Error Calculation Technique

Jevin Tong

March 25th, 2022

1 Introduction

It is human to err. Unlike the cold steel of machinery, flesh and blood are prone to moments of weakness, such as forgetting about the existence of Sigbovik until the day that paper submissions are due. Furthermore, the unpredictability of humans makes it difficult to calculate the amount of errors that they can be expected to create in a given period of time. We[1] propose an experiment to "eliminate a pair of avians while utilizing a singular rock", as they say, by attempting to create a valid submission for Sigbovik in under 30 minutes using one average human test subject[1], in order to determine the average amount of grammatical and syntactical errors produced during the production of a paper.

2 Experiment Setup

To simulate a scenario of error-proneness, the subject was situated in a college apartment at 1:48 AM, and instructed to create a submission for Sigbovik 2022 after being reminded of the conference's existence a few mere minutes before being instructed to type the paper. Very little LaTeX experience was provided to the subject (although the internet as a resource was provided for the sake of LaTeX readability/reader benefit), and the subject's exposure to the formal stylings of academic writings has been relatively limited in scope. In order to compel the subject to type for the duration of the experiment, the subject was asked to think about the magnitude of their remaining homework load, thus motivating it to work on the paper in the spirit of ungodly procrastination.

3 Results

Due to the squiggly red lines, the subject was able to identify most of its spelling mistakes immediately and rectify those on the fly. As a result, most of the simple mistakes that subject would have made were obfuscated, which thus made the subject's biggest error its decision to choose error calculation as the subject of the paper. Fortunately, the subject was too sleep deprived to notice and correct any natural and egregious grammatical/syntactical[2] mistakes it had made that would not have been caught by the auto-speller. Furthermore, we observed that the subject made numerous revisions to the paper regarding the premise of the paper, as during brief moments of lucidity, it realized the futility of the paper's initial premise and frantically attempted to steer the paper in the direction of a better joke. From the paper produced, we can tell that about multiple mistakes were produced over the course of 30 minutes, suggesting that humans are pretty unpredictable, I guess.

4 Further Research

Due to the subject's immense propensity for procrastination, further studies into the error production of the subject will be easy to reproduce.

---

[1] I, me, myself, etc.
[2] The difference between the two being unknown to the writer