

Understanding Why Authors Edit Writing

1. Instructions

You will be given an original and an edited version of a phrase (typically consisting of one sentence each). It is your job to determine **one or more** reasons that the original phrase needed editing.

For each version of the phrase, the red text indicates words that were removed, green text represents words that were added, and black words are words that were not changed.

There are definitions of each category, examples of each category with an explanation, and then 6 questions to answer.

Not knowing the answer is ok; part of this is understanding why certain categories are harder to understand than others.

These phrases come from PDFs. In order to make phrases more uniform, mathematical equations such as $a \neq 0$ or $\Sigma = \{\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$ have been replaced with [MATH].

2. Category Definitions

1. The original phrase was missing information.
2. The original phrase had too much information.
3. The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
4. The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
5. The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
6. It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
7. It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would *not* help you make a decision.

3. Reference Examples

3.1. Example #1

Now, in order to reproduce the behavior of the projections of the exact Bohmian trajectories in the system subspace, we can consider the following simple trajectory model, which gathers both decoherence and loss of empty-slit information.

In order to observe such a behavior, we can further proceed with our model as follows.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☒ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☒ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

- Removing **Now** indicates that the original phrase had a voice/tone problem. It was an extraneous word that shifted focus from the main point of the phrase.
- Changing **reproduce the behavior of the projections of the exact Bohmian trajectories in the system subspace** to **observe such a behavior** indicates that the original phrase had too much information.
- Changing **consider the following simple trajectory** to **further proceed with our** indicates that (1) there is a issue with the linguistic style, because **consider the following** and **further proceed with** have the same meaning but different tone; and (2) that **simple trajectory** was unnecessary information for the reader.
- Finally, simplifying **which gathers both decoherence and loss of empty-slit information** to **as follows** indicates that there was too much information in this part of the phrase as well.

3.2. Example #2

Then, we can estimate the logical error rate **of the error rate** [MATH], which **is given by** [MATH] where [MATH], [MATH] and [MATH].

Given fitting parameters [MATH], [MATH], [MATH] and [MATH], we can estimate the logical error rate **for error rates** [MATH] **by replacing** [MATH] with [MATH], which **gives** [MATH] where [MATH], [MATH] and [MATH].

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☒ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☒ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

- Changing **Then** to **Given fitting parameters** [MATH], [MATH], [MATH] and [MATH] explains what conditions are necessary, and indicates that the original phrase was missing information.
- Changing **of the error rate** **for error rates** doesn't indicate missing or redundant information; neither is it an issue with
- Adding **by replacing** [MATH] with [MATH] further details the process, again indicating that the original phrase was missing information.
- Changing **is given by** to **gives** doesn't suggest missing or redundant information; rather, it indicates that the original phrase was not concise enough, which is a stylistic problem.

3.3. Example #3

However, due to the interference quenching, the extent of this behavior is reduced in both space and time: in space because the interference effects are stronger for the innermost trajectories [which give rise to the central peaks in **Figure** XX(a)] and in time because the time-of-flight of the neutrons, [MATH], is **such that** [MATH].

However, due to the interference quenching, the extent of this behavior is reduced in both space and time: in space because the interference effects are stronger for the innermost trajectories [which give rise to the central peaks in **Fig.** XX(a)] and in time because the time-of-flight of the neutrons ([MATH] s) is **slightly larger than** [MATH].

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☒ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☒ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

- Changing **Figure** to **Fig.** indicates that **Figure** is not appropriate for the target audience, and that they prefer **Fig.**. Something was wrong with the formatting.
- Changing **such that** to **slightly larger than** doesn't fit any of the categories. It doesn't indicate redundant or missing information, it's not an issue with the tone or formatting. There is not an error in the original phrase. If you had enough information about the context, you might be able to choose, so *"It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision"* is an appropriate choice.

3.4. Example #4

In the case [MATH], when a [MATH] error occurs, an [MATH] error and some Pauli errors always occur simultaneously (**Sec. XX**).

In the case [MATH], when a [MATH] error occurs, an [MATH] error and some Pauli errors always occur simultaneously (**see Appendix XX**).

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☒ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

- Again, this change doesn't fit neatly into one of the categories. Changing from a **Sec.** to an **Appendix** doesn't indicate redundant or missing information; it is not a spelling or grammatical error; there isn't a tone or voice issue; formatting is not a problem in the original phrase. More information about the context most likely wouldn't help, so choosing *"It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision."* is appropriate.

4. Unlabeled Examples

4.1. Question #1

Alternatively, one can choose to repeat the distillation circuit (the entangled state generation part) for once if a failure occurs.

Alternatively, one can choose to repeat the distillation circuit (the entangled-state generation part, [see Fig. XX](#)) for once if a failure occurs.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.2. Question #2

Note that, in the coordinate representation and for an environment constituted by [MATH] particles, **equation (XX) should be obtained after integrating [MATH] over the 3[MATH] environment degrees of freedom, i.e., [MATH] with [MATH], [MATH] being a 3-dimensional vector.**

Note that, in the coordinate representation and for an environment constituted by [MATH] particles, **Eq. (XX) becomes [MATH].**

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.3. Question #3

Notice that despite **the fact that** there is no coherence **here**, trajectories do not cross the symmetry axis **separating** the **regions covered by each slit**.

Notice that despite there is no coherence (**in the sense that the interference terms of the reduced density matrix have been damped out**), trajectories do not cross the symmetry axis **between** the **two slits** because they obey Eq. (XX), which contains **information about the two slits open simultaneously**.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.4. Question #4

Without **fermion-parity** errors, one can eliminate all errors by iterating distillation circuits to achieve fault-tolerant quantum computing.

Without **charge** errors, one can eliminate all errors by iterating distillation circuits to achieve fault-tolerant quantum computing.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.5. Question #5

Unlike B16, we have simultaneously fit both the Spitzer and K2 data with both transit and Spitzer's systematic models, which has allowed us to reduce residual systematics **by which** the results of B16 **were biased**.

Unlike B16, we have simultaneously fit both the Spitzer and K2 data with both **the** transit **model** and Spitzer's systematic models, which has allowed us to reduce the residual systematics **that biased** the results of B16.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.6. Question #6

When [MATH] (no distillation), [MATH] and [MATH]; when [MATH], [MATH] can be obtained numerically by simulating the distillation circuit.

Without the PP distillation, [MATH] and [MATH]; when the distillation is performed, [MATH] can be obtained numerically by simulating the distillation circuit.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.7. Question #7

Trajectory-based approaches have **receive** much attention in the last years as a potential tool to handle and study high-dimensional complex quantum **phenomena** [CITATION].

Trajectory-based approaches have **received** much attention in the last years as a potential tool to handle and study high-dimensional complex quantum **systems** [CITATION].

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:

4.8. Question #8

In the coordinate representation, the associate density matrix, ρ , reads as ρ_{ij} with ρ_{ii} . The diagonal of equation (1) gives the probability density (measured intensity), ρ_{ii} with ρ_{ii} being a space and time dependent phase-shift between the two partial waves.

In the coordinate representation, the element ρ_{ij} of the associate density matrix, ρ , will read as ρ_{ij} and the diagonal terms giving the probability density as ρ_{ii} with ρ_{ii} . In this last expression, ρ_{ii} is the space and time dependent phase-shift between the two partial waves.

Choose one or more reasons explaining why the original phrase needed editing.

- ☐ The original phrase was missing information.
- ☐ The original phrase had too much information.
- ☐ The original phrase had a spelling or grammatical error.
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because of vocabulary, phrasing, voice or tone
- ☐ The original phrase was hard to understand because it didn't match the formatting conventions for the intended audience.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, but more information would let you make a decision.
- ☐ It doesn't fit in any category, and more information would not help you make a decision.

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the first phrase?

☐ On a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being easy, 4 being hard), how hard was it to understand the second phrase?

Explanation:
