

arXivEdits: Understanding the Human **Revision Process in Scientific Writing**

Chao Jiang, Wei Xu, and Samuel Stevens





Full multi-

page papers.

1. Revisions in Scientific Writing

- Researchers devote a huge amount of efforts to revise their papers.
- Valuable Knowledge is Encoded.
- Logical and structural improvement at doc.-level. Stylistic and grammatical refinement at sent.-level.
- Source of revision: two adjacent versions of the

same paper on arXiv. Submission history

From: Ashish Vaswani [view email] [v1] Mon, 12 Jun 2017 17:57:34 UTC (1,102 KB) [v2] Mon, 19 Jun 2017 16:49:45 UTC (1,125 KB) [v3] Tue, 20 Jun 2017 05:20:02 UTC (1,125 KB) [v4] Fri, 30 Jun 2017 17:29:30 UTC (1,124 KB) [v5] Wed, 6 Dec 2017 03:30:32 UTC (1,124 KB)

Sentence alignment for 751 paper groups across 6 research areas in 23 years.

2. arXivEdits Corpus

A Paragraph in Early Draft

(s1)Energy markets are driven by innovation, path-dependent technology costs and diffusion; yet, common optimisation modelling methodologies $s^{1} \rightarrow$ emain vague on these aspects and have a limited ability to address the effectiveness of policy onto decision-making since the latter is not specifically represented. (s2) This leads to an underestimation of noncost-optimal technology lock-ins known to occur. (s3) Breaking with $s3 \rightarrow Deletion$ tradition, our approach explores bottom-up ...

The Paragraph in Final Version Operation

Split & *t*1 (1) Energy markets are driven by innovation, path-dependent technology *choices* and diffusion. (t2) *However, conventional* optimisation models **▶** t2 ack detail on these aspects and have limited ability to address the effectiveness of policy interventions because they do not represent $s2 \rightarrow Revise \rightarrow t3$ decision-making. (t3) As a result, known effects of technology lock-ins are liable to be underestimated. (t4) In contrast, our approach places **Insertion** \rightarrow t4 investor decision-making ...

Fine-grained sentence level edits with intentions for 1,000 sentence pairs.

3. An Automatic System

- Task 1: Span-level Edit Extraction
- Baseline Prior work rely on diff algorithm to extract edits, which is based on minimizing edit distance regardless of semantic meaning.
- We formulated it as span alignment task.
- Our method can extract more fine-grained and explainable edits.
- Word alignment models:
- neural semi-CRF aligner. Qur model @ACL2021!
- QA-Align (Nagata et al., 2020).
- Baseline: Latexdiff

	Perf. (P	/ R /F1)		% c	of Edit Ty	/pes	Le	n. of Ec	dits
Р	R	F1	EM	Ins.	Del.	Sub.	Ins.	Del.	Sub



Revise

Improve Language		28.6%
More Accurate/specific	Minor adjustment to improve the accuracy or specificness of the description.	11.5%
Improve Style	Make the text sound more professional or coherent without altering the meaning.	8.7%
Simplify	Simplify complex concepts or delete redundant content to improve readability.	7.6%
Other	Other language improvements that don't fall into the above categories.	0.8%
Correct Grammer/Typo	Fix grammatical errors, correct typos, or smooth out grammar needed by other changes.	25.4%
Update Content	Update large amount of scientific content, add or delete major fact.	28.8%
Adjust Format	Adjust table, figure, equation, reference, citation, and punctuation etc.	17.2%



|--|

Semi-CRF Aligner	87.5	87.7	87.6	80.5	32.9	26.7	40.4	4.66	4.98	2.21
QA-Align	87.7	88.4	88.0	82.0	33.2	24.0	42.9	4.46	4.62	2.08
Latexdiff	76.2	74.3	75.3	70.0	26.2	14.4	59.3	3.89	4.27	4.73
Latexdiff treats everything as large										

Laterum incats everything as large chunk substitutions

- Task 2: Automatic Sentence Alignment.
- A neural CRF word alignment model trained on our corpus achieves 93.8 F1. Our model @ACL2020!

Methods	Precision	Recall	F1
Char. 3-gram (Štajner et al.)	87.7	87.7	87.7
TF-IDF (Paetzold et al.)	90.3	91.6	<u>90.9</u>
Jaccard (Xu et al.)	<u>90.7</u>	89.5	90.1
BLEU (Faruqui et al.)	89.9	89.6	89.8
Neural CRF aligner (ours)	96.9	<u>91.0</u>	93.8

Task 3: Intention Classification.

- The best Performing T5-large model achieve accuracy on fine-grained classification task.
- Question 2: Do researchers in all areas have same practice when revising papers?
- No. Researchers in STAT make more significant revisions compared to CS.



Question 3: Where do researchers revise their papers?

More sentences at the beginning are edited.

The insertion and deletion of sentences occur more in the latter parts.

