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ABSTRACT

English as Additional Language (EAL) scholarly writers have to overcome numerous obstacles to meet the expectations of editors and peer reviewers before they can publish their research articles in international journals published in English. A number of shapers (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003) are often involved in revising such articles before their eventual publication. This study focuses on the revision changes made by an author’s editor to a corpus of such articles leading up to their eventual publication. Based on textual analysis of the early drafts and published manuscripts of 15 SCI-indexed journal articles by Chinese doctoral students, a double-entry coding scheme was developed to describe 5160 revision changes made to the manuscripts, in terms of five types of revision, i.e., substitution, correction, addition, deletion, and rearrangement, and four different lexico-grammatical levels, i.e., morpheme, word, group and clause/clause complex. With the exception of correction, a category which applies to surface-level errors (which do not affect meaning), and is the second most frequent category of changes, all of the other categories represent changes which often substantially alter the meanings of the texts and which involve negotiation between the editor and the writer. The theoretical and pedagogical implications of the findings are discussed with reference to previous studies focusing on revision changes and to debates concerning English as a Lingua Franca franca and World Englishes.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

With English having established itself as the dominant language for international scholarly communication, English as an Additional Language (EAL) scholars are under enormous pressure to have their research articles published in SCI/SSCI-indexed international journals, the great majority of which are published in English. In order to meet the degree requirement, doctoral students studying science and engineering in major research universities in China (and increasingly in other jurisdictions), for example, are expected to publish at least one research article in an SCI-indexed journal (Li, 2005). It has been widely acknowledged that EAL scholars have to overcome considerable difficulties in order to publish their research in international journals (Canagarajah, 1996; Cho, 2004; Flowerdew, 1999; Salager-Meyer, 2008). Among other things, they may experience linguistic problems such as “less facility of expression,” “less rich vocabulary,” and “intervention from their first language” (Flowerdew, 1999). Furthermore, it has been argued that such writers may have to negotiate with journal
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editors and peer reviewers with “authorial persistence”, i.e. making continuous efforts to revise and resubmit their manuscripts, if they want to eventually have their research articles published (Belcher, 2007), a process which is likely to be more difficult for an EAL writer.

Contributions from EAL scholars working in the developing world are crucial for the global development of scientific research (Canagarajah, 1996; Van Dijk, 1994). Based on interviews with a dozen journal editors, Flowerdew (2001) also reported on the importance of EAL scholarly work, as EAL scholars often have access to research sites and data that are not reachable by researchers in the developed world. In response to the needs of EAL academic writers, the editors of an international research journal on comparative education have developed a mentoring program to help EAL authors to improve their manuscripts (Lillis, Magyar, & Robinson-Pant, 2010). In addition to this writing for publication program, efforts have been made to help EAL scholars to improve their academic writing and publication skills through courses and workshops (Cargill & O’Connor, 2006). Furthermore, there is a flourishing industry of scholarly editorial services.

For most EAL scholars who lack access to such programs or cannot afford the editing services, their manuscripts are often shaped by a number of literacy brokers before achieving publication (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Li & Flowerdew, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2006). Based on “text histories” they conducted, Lillis & Curry (2010, p. 93) recognized two types of literacy brokers: academic brokers, focusing on the content of research articles, and language brokers, more concerned with linguistic presentation. The line between academic brokers and language brokers is not always clear cut, however. EAL authors are often asked by journal editors and reviewers to seek help from native-speakers of English with expertise in their field to edit their manuscripts (e.g., Willey & Tanimoto, 2013). As it is not easy to access such native-speakers who are familiar with their subject matter, EAL scholars often seek help from “convenience editors,” non-content specialists with a good command of English, who are often language teachers in the author’s universities (Willey & Tanimoto, 2012, 2013).

Despite the research attention paid to the shapers of manuscripts and the literacy brokers involved in the editing of manuscripts, except for a small number of studies, little is known about the actual editing or revision changes that are made to help EAL authors achieve publication. Burrough-Boenisch (2003, p. 224) has referred to editors who do such work as being able to “give insightful ‘from the coalface’ perspectives on the handling of NNS texts” and has called for more research attention to be paid to these “intuitive and experienced language experts,” because such people “could contribute to training people for this emerging profession.” The present study seeks to occupy this research gap by analyzing a set of data “from the coalface,” that is to say, the revision changes made to manuscripts that were initially deemed unacceptable for publication by journal editors and reviewers but which, following editing, were eventually published. While all of the manuscripts analyzed in this article were edited by one author’s editor, and so this is a single case, it is hoped that this study of how these manuscripts were edited may begin to further our knowledge of this important issue in the field of English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP).

2. Literature review and theoretical issues addressed in the study

2.1. The roles of author’s editors and the reasons behind revision changes

The important roles of author’s editors in shaping the manuscripts of EAL scholars have long been recognized by previous scholars (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Shashok, 2001). These editing roles have been given a number of different labels, including “language professional” (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003), “convenience editor” (Willey & Tanimoto, 2013), “author’s editor” (Shashok, 2001), and “literacy broker” (Lillis & Curry, 2010). In this article, we use the term “author’s editor,” as this is the preferred term by organizations such as the Mediterranean Editors and Translators (e.g., “Roles of the author’s editor in an increasingly competitive knowledge industry,” n.d.).

However, as already indicated, revision changes have been the focus of only a small number of studies in second language writing for publication. Burrough-Boenisch (2005) simulated a set of peer review sessions by soliciting comments on three research article drafts from 45 experts from eight countries in a given field, focusing on the changes made by the reviewers with particular regard to hedging strategies. In a subsequent paper, by adopting various strategies (including interacting with authors, checking expert corpora, and following recommendations from more powerful gatekeepers such as journal editors and peer reviewers), Burrough-Boenisch (2006) focused on how an author’s editor edited EAL manuscripts. Concerned with authors’ identity transformation, Englander (2009) proposed a social constructionist model of revision and identified six factors that construct the author’s “changing autobiographical identities” during revision. One factor that is particularly relevant to the present study is “language resourcefulness” (p. 44), which refers to the strategies adopted by the L2 authors to deal with criticisms of the English language used in their manuscripts. In another study, Willey & Tanimoto (2012) compared editors from disciplinary and language backgrounds, with a specific focus on their editing strategies, including points at which the editors would like to consult the authors, their revision of definite articles, and their attitudes towards the editing process. By analyzing a corpus of working papers peer-reviewed for content but not for language, Anderson (2010) offered an
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1 Authorial persistence is probably also necessary for native speaker scholars, but the Belcher study was conducted in the context of EAL scholars.

2 It is important to note that we are not claiming that the articles in this study were accepted only due to the corrections that were made during the editing process. Changes to content are also likely to have been made and writers may have received additional help with their manuscripts. Nevertheless, after editing, the language was deemed to have been acceptable by the journal editors.
account of “how English is used in an international academic context” and found that the practices deviate from the “native speaker” norms in terms of a number of linguistic features, including use of articles, prepositional choice, position of adverbs, and word order in embedded questions. Finally, in a critical examination of editing practices from multiple theoretical perspectives, Heng Hartse and Kubota (2014) found the revision changes made by an editor of a single book chapter to be rather subjective, idiosyncratic, susceptible to native-speaker intuition, and not conducive to a more pluralized approach to academic English.

The above studies, while revealing, are somewhat limited in terms of range of revision changes (e.g., Willey & Tanimoto, 2012; focus only on the definite article); the number of participants (e.g., Englander, 2009; studies only three authors); the size of the corpus used (e.g., Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014; based their work on the revision of just one book); or the nature of the corpus (e.g., Anderson, 2010, analysed working papers rather than international refereed journal articles). This is the research gap that we intend to address in this study, with a larger data set of a wider variety of revision changes.

2.2. English as a Lingua Franca franca and World Englishes debates

In recent years, scholars in applied linguistics have developed a new perspective on English as an international language – English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) – a perspective which views the English language not as the property of native-speakers of English but as an instrument shared by users (including scholars) all over the world for international communication, whether or not they follow the exact conventions of standard English. Jenkins (2013), for example, has argued that research articles from EAL contributors should be acceptable in terms of linguistic presentation as long as their language is “intelligible” (p. 53). Parallel to the ELF movement, researchers in World Englishes (WE) have also argued that variation from Standard English should be accepted in international publication (e.g., Matsuda & Matsuda, 2010). In a study of the language of a small corpus of award-winning scientific research articles, Rozycki and Johnson (2013) found that, despite their indisputable scholarly merit (they had all received awards from top journals in the field), the articles in their study contained numerous “non-canonical” (non-standard) grammatical features. The authors argued that the presence of such grammatical irregularities in top research articles suggested that EAL authors and English teachers may not need to pay so much attention to grammatical issues when seeking publication. What remains unknown, however, from Rozycki and Johnson’s (2013) study, is how much the authors had needed to revise their manuscripts leading up to publication. It is entirely possible that the authors had to revise their manuscripts substantially before they could be accepted.

2.3. The theoretical issues to be addressed in this study

A number of theoretical issues are considered in the present study. To begin with, the issue of how manuscripts are revised by different shapers to meet the expectations of gatekeepers of research journals has both theoretical appeal and practical interest for the ERPP research community. Second, the taxonomy of types of revision changes made by the author’s editor on the corpus of published research articles which will be developed in the study will provide a basis for further comparative work to see how other authors’ editors might classify the changes they make. Based on our results, we also intend to revisit the arguments made by some English as a Lingua Franca and World Englishes scholars that non-standard English used by EAL writers should be accepted in international refereed journal articles. Finally, a number of pedagogical implications for language teachers interested in helping EAL scholars will also be addressed.

3. Research background and research questions

3.1. The story of an author’s editor as the shaper of manuscripts

Before introducing the small corpus built for this study, it is helpful to provide some background information about the co-author of this article who acted as an author’s editor (Wang, henceforth “author’s editor”), who was heavily involved in shaping the research articles that made up the corpus. The author’s editor previously worked as an English language teacher in a major research university in China, where students and faculty members in science and engineering are expected to publish research articles in international journals. He was brought up in Mainland China and Hong Kong, but has an undergraduate degree and a master’s degree from universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. In 2008, he started to offer editing services to doctoral students in his university and helped them to revise their manuscripts.

Since the work was not part of his job description as a language teacher, the author’s editor charged a fee based on the length of the manuscript and the amount of work involved in revision. Over the years, he worked with numerous authors in his university, many of whom were introduced to him through former clients who had successfully published their papers with his help. There are over 60 research articles that have been published in SCI-indexed or EI-indexed (Engineering Index) research journals with his name printed in the Acknowledgement sections.

It is important to bear in mind that when he worked with the student writers the author’s editor was a language teacher with little formal training in applied linguistics. He was doing the editing job based on his experience and intuition about the English language and relied heavily on the student writers’ knowledge of the literature, which he and the student writers used as a “textual mentor,” i.e., the use of model source texts to inform one’s own writing (Flowerdew & Wang, in press). On the other hand, the second author is currently pursuing a Ph.D. degree in applied linguistics with a focus on academic...
literacies and ESP. Therefore, he is essentially studying his earlier self as an author’s editor in retrospect through time-traveling made possible by the records kept in his computer.

3.2. Single case study approach

The advantages and disadvantages of the single case study method adopted here have been widely debated in the literature. While case study as an approach is often contrasted with more quantitative approaches involving experiments, it has been widely acknowledged that more mixed-method studies are needed in the field of applied linguistics (Duff, 2012). This present case study incorporates both qualitative (in terms of a reflective account of editing) and quantitative (in terms of systematic analysis of a corpus of revision changes), with the hope of taking advantages of both types of approach. Another advantage of the single case study is its exploratory nature, which enables the researcher to develop theories based on the findings of the data (Duff, 2012). The present study is driven by the data collected from the editing practices of one author’s editor from which a modified coding scheme is developed and various theoretical findings from previous studies are either confirmed or challenged. Of course, a disadvantage of a single case study, such as the one presented here, is that the findings are not transferable. No claims can be made about the transferability of the working practices of the author’s editor in this study or about the taxonomy of editorial changes developed in this article, therefore. Nevertheless, the findings of the present case study may resonate with the practices of other author’s editors and in that way be transferable, and the taxonomy, as an initial attempt, may form a baseline for further research.

3.3. Editing as a process of meaning negotiation

Since the data collected for this study come from manuscripts that were edited by the author’s editor, it is useful to describe briefly how he interacted with the original authors while trying to improve their manuscripts. The editing process typically consisted of four stages. At the first stage, the author’s editor would review the entire manuscript and correct any surface-level issues, such as grammar and spelling that could be easily fixed. Simultaneously, the editor would also highlight issues that required further discussion with the original authors, which were usually problems related to word choice and awkward sentences that obscured the clarity of meanings. This practice echoes the finding of Willey and Tanimoto (2015) that author’s editors often need to consult the author to deal with uncertainties, as well as the account of copyediting reported by Heng Hartse and Kubota (2014), in which word choice and clarity were a major issue. The author would then receive a document with some errors corrected and many sentences marked up for various issues.

At the second stage, the author and the author’s editor would meet in person or hold an audio chat via Skype to go through the entire manuscript again. For each issue at sentence level, the author would explain what s/he intended to say and the editor would suggest a way to revise the manuscript. Sometimes, the author would accept the revised version, but it was also common that the author had to further clarify what s/he meant and the editor would try to come up with a better revised version. The entire conversation was carried out in Mandarin Chinese, the first language shared by the author and the editor. From time to time, the author would be asked to look up the literature using Google Scholar (Brezina, 2012; Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014) or their own collection of research articles (textual mentors) to decide if a particular expression had been used by published authors and could be re-used in their manuscripts, a process known as “language re-use” (Flowerdew and Li, 2007; Flowerdew & Wang, in press). This process would usually take up to three to six hours, depending on the length of the manuscript and the amount of editing required. Once this second stage was finished, at the third stage, the author would then bring his/her manuscript to other shapers such as his/her Ph.D. supervisor and colleagues for further editing. Before the author submitted the final draft, at the final, fourth stage, the editor would review it one more time, suggesting some final touches when necessary.

3.4. Research questions

In this study, through analyzing the revision changes made to 15 manuscripts and reflecting on the editing practices of the author’s editor, we respond to the following research questions:

1) What roles may an author’s editor play in shaping the manuscripts of EAL scholars attempting to publish in international journals?
2) What revision changes were made by the author’s editor involved in this study, and what sort of taxonomy could be developed to account for the above revision changes?
3) In light of these revision changes, what does it mean for EAL scholars’ manuscripts to be acceptable or “intelligible” for publication in terms of language?

While the first question has been addressed by previous studies reviewed above, the present study may generate new insights into this question through developing a taxonomy of revision changes (Question 2) based on a set of first-hand data, thereby offering a fresh perspective on the debate on ELF and World Englishes (Question 3).
4. Corpus and method

4.1. The corpus of revision changes

To answer the research questions, 15 research articles which had been edited by the author’s editor and subsequently published in different SCI-indexed journals between 2011 and 2014 were selected to form a small, specialized corpus, based on the availability of the earlier drafts and whether the original authors were willing to grant permission to use the data for the present study. The corpus includes the initially unacceptable versions received by the author’s editor and the eventually published versions. The authors of these research articles had submitted their manuscripts to the target journals and the reviewers had asked them to address numerous issues at content level and improve the language of the manuscripts. Specifically, the authors were asked to improve their writing by seeking external help; for example, a typical comment from one reviewer was “consult a native speaker of English familiar with the discipline.” In response to the reviewers’ comments, the authors would first revise the manuscripts at the content level and then send the manuscripts to the author’s editor for further revision. In other words, the content issues had been addressed before the author’s editor tried to revise the manuscript. That being said, as will be shown in the findings, the subsequent revisions of the manuscripts still involved substantial changes at content level. Of course it is notoriously difficult to separate out language and content. For example, if an author’s editor points out to a client that an introduction does not clearly identify the research gap that the study is intended to occupy (Swales, 1990) and this is corrected, it could be argued that this is a content issue (although in the present study, rhetorical issues such as this were included as author’s edits).

4.2. Pre-processing of the corpus

To study revision changes, an undergraduate research assistant helped extract all of the sentences from the early version and the published version of the manuscripts in the corpus and loaded them onto a spreadsheet. Original sentences and revised sentences were placed into adjacent cells for comparison. Each pair of sentences was then loaded onto MaxQDA, a qualitative data analysis software tool. As shown in Table 1, among the 15 journal articles analyzed, the total number of sentences of each manuscript varies from 87 to 245 (with a standard deviation of 45.8) and the revision changes made to individual articles range from 199 to 569 (with a standard deviation of 113.4). On average, 2.48 revision changes had been made to each sentence (with a standard deviation of 0.5) before the manuscripts were eventually published. As will be shown in the findings section below, while the revision changes are identified and coded at sentence level, the issues addressed through such revision changes are not necessarily at this level, but may involve discourse-level issues.

### Table 1
Numbers of revision changes made to the 15 journal articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article code</th>
<th>Journal code</th>
<th>Impact factor and indexing</th>
<th>Number of sentences</th>
<th>Number of revision changes</th>
<th>Average number of revision changes per sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J01</td>
<td>Optics &amp; Laser Technology</td>
<td>1.675 SCI</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X03</td>
<td>Journal of Modern Optics</td>
<td>1.169 SCI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y01</td>
<td>Bioresource Technology</td>
<td>5.039 SCI</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W02</td>
<td>Review of Scientific Instruments</td>
<td>1.584 SCI</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L03</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Fuels</td>
<td>2.733 SCI</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery</td>
<td>1.657 SCI</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03</td>
<td>Bioresource Technology</td>
<td>5.039 SCI</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J02</td>
<td>Materials and Manufacturing Processes</td>
<td>1.486 SCI</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z02</td>
<td>Metrology and Measurement Systems</td>
<td>0.609 SCI</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01</td>
<td>Energy and Buildings</td>
<td>2.465 SCI</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X01</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering and Processing: Process Intensification</td>
<td>1.959 SCI</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02</td>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>3.406 SCI</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z01</td>
<td>International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control</td>
<td>3.821 SCI</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G01</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>2.175 SCI</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>Signal Processing</td>
<td>2.238 SCI</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>Average 2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Of course it is notoriously difficult to separate out language and content. For example, if an author’s editor points out to a client that an introduction does not clearly identify the research gap that the study is intended to occupy (Swales, 1990) and this is corrected, it could be argued that this is a content issue (although in the present study, rhetorical issues such as this were included as author’s edits).
### 4.3. The double-entry coding system for revision changes

When analyzing the data, we were particularly interested in developing a taxonomy that can systematically describe the revision changes, taking into account the research insights from previous studies. Such a taxonomy may be of interest to other researchers and editors concerned with author’s editing. However, it must be emphasized that it is the result of one individual’s work and may therefore be idiosyncratic in some respects. Specifically, the coding of the data is driven by the concerns with how and where the revision changes were made. Therefore, a double-entry coding system was developed through which each revision change was coded twice (See Table 2).

As shown on the left-hand side of Table 2, the first part of the coding system is concerned with the types of revision being made. Based on Chomsky’s earlier method for grouping sentence transformations, as discussed in Faigley and Witte (1981), there are four types of revision changes—deletion, addition, substitution, and rearrangement. (Examples of each type of change are given in the findings section below). Since this taxonomy is primarily concerned with revisions that alter the meanings of the texts (Faigley & Witte, 1981), it does not explicitly address the correction of surface-level errors. And since the present study deals with EAL authors who had to correct surface level errors found in their manuscripts, correction was also recognized as the fifth type of revision when coding the data.4

In addition to the five types of revision changes in our coding scheme, we are also interested in the levels of the linguistic elements at which the revision changes were made. Based on the rank scale of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), as shown on the right-hand side of Table 2, each revision change is also coded as a modification at one of four ranks: morpheme, word, group, and clause/clause complex.

Revision changes of one research article (J01) were coded together by the two co-authors and an undergraduate research assistant (RA) to help the RA become familiar with the coding system. The second author and the RA then independently coded a small set of revision changes (about 100 from X03) and reached an inter-coder agreement rate of 95.6%. The RA, after discussing and settling the coding disagreement with the second author, coded the rest of the data. The second author randomly checked 10 revision changes from each of the rest of the 14 articles and agreed with the coding in 97% of the cases.

### 5. Main findings: quantitative results and qualitative examples

#### 5.1. Overall picture

Table 3 presents the overall picture of the revision changes that were made before the manuscripts were accepted for publication. Of all of the revision changes, 39.4% are substitutions at different levels, with the majority of them at the word level. Corrections at morpheme and word levels constitute 29.3% of the revision changes, followed by addition (15.5%) and

---

4 This is not to imply that native-speakers do not make surface errors that might be in need of correction.
deletion (12.1%). Rearrangements were less frequent in the corpus, but, as the discussion below suggests, some rearrangements were crucial for clarifying the points made by the authors. For each revision type, there are a small number of cases that are difficult to attribute to a precise category and therefore classed as “undecided.” For example, the expression “and so on” in one sentence was replaced by “etc.” It is difficult to decide whether this change occurs at word level or group level.

5.2. Substitution

Table 4 shows the breakdown of substitutions, the most frequent of the editing categories, into sub-categories. Quantitatively, the top five lexico-grammatical levels where substitution occurs are verb (20.1%), clause (15.4%), prepositional group (11.6%), preposition (11.2%), and nominal group (9.0%). Unlike corrections, which mainly deal with grammatical correctness (see the next section below), substitutions are often made to alter the meanings of the text in some way or to alter inappropriate collocations. Consider substitutions of verbs, for example, which account for about 20% of all substitutions. In the following sentences (Ex. 1), the verb “highlighted” was replaced by the verb “favored” to emphasize a particular preference for the oxides. As a result, the intended meaning of the authors was expressed more clearly and precisely.

Ex. 1. Original: The Cu-based oxides are also highlighted for their high resistance to thermodynamic limitation for complete combustion of fuels, stable recyclability of oxygen release and uptake, being exothermic for fuel combustion in the FR and environmentally friendly.

Revised: The Cu-based oxides are also favored for their stable recyclability of oxygen release and uptake, exothermicity for fuel combustion in the FR and environmental friendliness relative to Co-based OC.

The following (Ex. 2) is an example of verb substitution that is related to the issue of collocation (e.g., Nesselhauf, 2003). The verb “laid” does not collocate appropriately with the noun “fault”; therefore, the alternative verb “placed” was used.

Ex. 2. Original: The artificial fault has been laid on the edge of grounding grid.

Revised: A fault has been placed on the edge of the grounding grid.

Collocation is also the dominant factor in substitution cases at other levels involving nouns and adjectives. In the following sentences (Ex. 3), a more appropriate adjective “sufficient” was used in place of the adjective “enough”:

Ex. 3. Original: In the CLC reactor, enough crushing strength is essential to realize multiple cycle utilization because the high temperature and high-speed fluidization can lead to oxygen carrier attrition and fragmentation.

Revised: In the CLC reactor, sufficient crushing strength of OC is essential for multiple cycle utilization because the high-temperature and high-speed fluidization can lead to OC attrition and fragmentation.

Table 4
Substitutions at different levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitution level</th>
<th>No. of revision changes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional group</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal group</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal group</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next example (Ex. 4), a substitution was made considering the intended meaning of the authors as well as appropriate collocation.

**Ex. 4.** Original: *The proximate and elemental components of pyrolytic chars were also measured.*

Revised: *The proximate and elemental composition of pyrolytic chars were also measured* (Chen et al., 2012).

Substitutions at clause level also account for over 15% of all cases of substitutions. These revision changes were often motivated by discourse level concerns. In Ex. 5, the clause “we may refer that” was replaced by “it is concluded that.” In addition, the author was too tentative in making a claim in the original version but the text became more assertive after revision.

**Ex. 5.** Original: *According to the relation of pressure and fan performance, we may refer that the smaller diameter will cause more energy used by the fan system and higher level fan noise.*

Revised: *Considering the relation between pressure and fan performance, it is concluded that the smaller diameter will increase the energy consumption by the fan system and higher level fan noise.*

### 5.3. Correction

A whole body of literature has been devoted to the issue of how to provide effective corrective feedback on EAL writing (e.g., Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008). Based on an interview study with 16 proofreaders in a university setting, Harwood et al. (2009) distinguished the corrections made at surface level and more substantial revision involving clarification of meanings of the original authors. The label “proofreading” corresponds to the surface level whereas “editing” refers to “discussing ideas and saying where things are really unclear so [writers] know where to look again” (Harwood et al., 2009). Nevertheless, our findings suggest that only about 30% of revision changes are cases of proofreading (in our terminology, correction), and the other categories are cases of editing during which the editor has to be more engaged with the author in negotiating the meanings of the texts.

Statistically, exactly one third (33.3%) of corrections were made regarding the usage of determiners (articles), which is also the first of the common non-canonical (NC) grammatical features identified by Rozycki and Johnson (2013) in their study, where this issue accounts for 35.8% of all NC grammatical features. Nearly 20% of corrections relate to the singular/plural forms of nouns, followed by corrections of punctuation usage and spelling errors. The remaining corrections involve verb forms, as well as confusion between parts of speech. No examples of revision changes in this category are provided here as they are quite similar to those discussed in Rozycki and Johnson (2013), but Table 5 presents the different types.

### 5.4. Addition

As can be seen in Table 6, additions are made most frequently at the lexico-grammatical levels of clause/clause complex (27.5%), noun (16.8%), prepositional group (11.5%), conjunction (9.0%), and verb (8.1%). For example, the following clause complex (sentence) (Ex. 7) was added (in consultation with the author) in one of the manuscripts in order to discuss future research direction (Ex. 7):

**Ex. 7.** *In future work, we will establish the corresponding experiment system to validate the simulation results and introduce the nano technology into the field of ventilation filed based on FADS, in order to create a clean and comfortable indoor environment.*

In some cases, clauses were added to improve the cohesion and coherence within and across sentences. For example, in Ex. 8, a clause “as discussed in Sect. 2.1.1” was added to refer to a different section within the manuscript.

**Ex. 8.** Original: *The same solution was prepared as freeze granulation method.*

Revised: *The same solution as discussed in Sect. 2.1.1 was prepared for testing the spray drying method.*

The next largest group of additions is concerned with nouns (16.8%), many of which are abstract nouns. For example, the noun “value” was added to the following (Ex. 9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction level</th>
<th>No. of revision changes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>determiner</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s/es for plural</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed/irregular verb</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s/es/singular verb</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 9. Original: *Thus, there exists a threshold of supply air flow rate for a given FADS in order to obtain a proper pressure inside FADS and an economic fan energy consumption.*

Revised: *Thus, there exists a threshold value of supply air flow rate for a given FADS in order to obtain a proper pressure inside FADS and reduce fan energy consumption.*

Prepositional groups are the next group of additions in our data, accounting for 11.5% of all additions. Usually prepositional groups were added to sentences to provide more information about the nominal groups being modified, in order to clarify the author’s meanings. In Ex. 10, in the original sentence, a possessive pronoun “their” was used to pre-modify “relationship” with reference to the information in previous sentences. In the revised version, such information was spelled out in a prepositional group to avoid any confusion for the reader. As clearly shown in this example, the revision changes at clause complex (in this case, sentence) level are often made by the editor in order to take into account the wider context and address issues at the level of discourse.

Ex. 10. Original: *Their relationship satisfies the Dupuit-Forchheimer relation [18].*

Revised: *The relationship between the microscopic values and the macroscopic values satisfies the Dupuit-Forchheimer relation [20].*

The above examples show clearly that many of the additions are made to the manuscripts to address issues that are beyond surface-level grammar. It was felt by the author’s editor that these additions improved the readability and clarity of the texts by building in greater textual cohesion.

5.5. Deletion

A large proportion of deletions (29.8%) were made at clause/clause complex level, for various reasons (Table 7). Also significant are the deletions of prepositional groups (12.2%), nouns (11.4%), conjunctions (9.9%) and adverbs (8.1%). One important consideration is the desire for conciseness or the removal of unnecessary information. For example, in the following clause complex (Ex. 11), the clause “in order to match the requirement of buildings beauty” was removed from the original, probably because the issue was not immediately relevant to the main topic of the research article:

Ex. 11. Original: *In order to match the requirement of buildings beauty, it can be designed into various types, such as cylinder, half-cylinder, and quarter cylinder and can be dyed with various colors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions at multiple levels.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause/clause complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deletions at multiple levels.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause/clause complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Various types of fabrics have been designed such as cylinder, half-cylinder, and quarter cylinder which can be dyed with various colors.

Sometimes, certain clauses were removed to reduce the redundancies or wordiness in the texts, as in Ex. 12, where the clause “the details can be seen in our earlier work” was deleted.

**Ex. 12.** Original: Based on the above assumptions, the mass and momentum conservation equations are written in tensor notation as follows, the details can be seen in our earlier work [11]:

Revised: Based on the above assumptions, the mass and momentum conservation equations of airflow through FADS are written in tensor notation as follows [11].

The second largest type of deletions was concerned with prepositional groups (12.2%). The reasons for such deletions were similar to those for deletions of clauses. Certain information does not have to be provided explicitly when readers can make inferences from the context. For example, the prepositional group “for comparison” was removed from the original sentence, as follows (Ex. 13):

**Ex. 13.** Original: As shown in Fig. 8a, the filling state of the molten metal exhibited an obvious turbulence under larger gas flow rate. For comparison, the filling state of the molten metal showed a stable filling under lower gas flow rate, as shown in Fig. 8b.

Revised: As shown in Fig. 8(a), the molten metal exhibited an obvious turbulence under a high gas flow rate. As shown in Fig. 8(b), the molten metal was filled in a stable manner under lower gas flow rate.

It is clear from the parallel structures in the two sentences that a comparison was made and the readers can recognize it without explicit reminders. The deletions made also went beyond surface issues of correctness.

### 5.6. Rearrangement

Rearrangement refers to changes in the position of words and phrases in the sentence (Table 8). Over 22% of rearrangements occur at the level of prepositional groups. Other cases of rearrangement involve adverbs (15.8%), nominal groups (15.3%), verbal groups (14.7%), and clauses (9.6%). Although rearrangements were relatively infrequent compared to more prominent revision changes, such changes are quite important in improving the overall quality of the manuscripts. Consider the original sentence of Ex. 14. It is not clear which part of the text the prepositional group “unlike the democratic penalization of L0 norm” refers to. By inserting the prepositional group before the subject of the sentence, as “parenthetical structure” (Biber et al., 1999, p. 1067), the reader would find it easier to parse the sentence. Also found in the example is a case of correction from “can resulting” to “can result.”

**Ex. 14.** Original: Even more important, the convex relaxation with an L1 penalty term can resulting in larger coefficients penalized more heavily in the L1 norm than smaller coefficients, unlike the democratic penalization of L0 norm.

Revised: Even more importantly, unlike the democratic penalization of L0 norm, the convex relaxation with an L1 penalty term can result in larger coefficients penalized more heavily in the L1 norm than smaller coefficients.

Adverbs, nominal groups, and verbal groups were equally prominent in rearrangements, each with a frequency of about 15%. In Ex. 15, the adverbs “considerably” and “significantly” were placed after the verbs they modified to follow the conventions in English, whereas in Chinese adverbs are often placed before the verbs being modified.

**Ex. 15.** Original: Accordingly, the oxygen content considerably decreased, and the elemental carbon fraction significantly increased.

Revised: Consequently, the oxygen content decreased considerably, and the elemental carbon fraction increased significantly.

As shown in the examples here, while rearrangements do not necessarily affect the semantics of the text, it was felt by the author’s editor that they were needed for improving the overall readability of the manuscripts. It may also be noted that in the above examples more than one revision change may be found, in addition to rearrangement.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rearrangement level</th>
<th>No. of revision changes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Discussion

In this discussion section, we will respond to the three research questions posed earlier in this article.

6.1. What roles may an author’s editor play in shaping the manuscripts of EAL scholars aiming to publish in international journals?

The editing practices reported in this study involved continuous negotiation between the editor and the original authors who co-created meaning at the word, sentence, and discourse levels. These practices are rather different from editing practices in other contexts. Commercial editing services such as the English language editing service provided by Elsevier, which is often recommended by journal editors, has an online system for authors to upload their manuscripts, and the revised version is returned in 4–7 business days (“Language Services for scientific, technical and medical content | Elsevier Webshop, 2016). With this service, there is no opportunity for authors to interact with editors to negotiate the meanings of their texts. Using protocol analysis in which the editing tasks were videotaped and analyzed through retrospective verbalization, Bisaillon (2007) studied the editing strategies of six professional editors, but these editors had no communication with the original authors while working on their manuscripts.

In contrast, the experience of the author’s editor in the present study, who continuously communicated with his authors in their first language, Mandarin Chinese, is consistent with Willey and Tanimoto’s (2013, p. 30) finding that “authors’ involvement in the editing process” is “necessary in order for them to clarify points” and that “the ability to communicate with authors in the author’s native language” is “a desirable skill.” Furthermore, the finding also supports the argument that author’s editors who can communicate with EAL scholars in their native language may be at an advantage in such editing roles over editors who have English as their L1 but who are not highly proficient in the L1 of the authors (He & Gan, 2008; Willey & Tanimoto, 2013).

The primary goal of the author’s editor was to help the authors improve the manuscripts so that they could be successfully published in their target journals. While developing the authors’ writing skills was not the explicit objective of the editing practices, some authors also claimed that they had learned a lot from the author’s editor about revising their manuscripts in the process. They often found it very useful to communicate with the author’s editor, who may have helped them to clarify what they meant to say through discussion in Chinese and find the right expression in English through continuous negotiation and consultation with the literature as textual mentors.

6.2. What revision changes were made by the author’s editor involved in this study and what sort of taxonomy could be developed to account for the above revision changes?

In this article, we have provided a descriptive account of the changes made by the author’s editor and developed a taxonomy of the changes made, each of which may belong to one of the five types (substitution, correction, deletion, addition, and rearrangement) and occur at a number of different lexico-grammatical levels (morpheme, word, group, and clause/clause complex). This taxonomy is based on Faigley and Witte’s (1981) categories for L1 writers, with the addition of the correction category for surface errors and the addition of the different levels. This is a first attempt at a taxonomy for EAL writers (to our knowledge) and no claims can be made as to its possible transferability. However, it may provide a useful baseline for future studies. We have also provided quantitative data to show the relative frequency of the different types of changes, which may also be of interest to other researchers or practitioners.

6.3. In light of these revision changes, what does it mean for EAL scholars’ manuscripts to be acceptable or “intelligible” for publication in terms of language?

With regard to this question, two issues are at stake: the extent to which non-canonical grammatical features need to be revised and the notion of intelligibility in the editorial process of manuscripts for international journals.

6.3.1. Non-canonical grammar as the tip of the iceberg

One important point to make about the findings of this study is that non-canonical grammatical features such as those found in the published articles studied by Rozycki and Johnson (2013) are merely the tip of the iceberg, if we take into account the numerous errors that were corrected in the manuscripts in this study before they were accepted for publication. Many of the edits in the correction category in our data involve what Rozycki and Johnson (2013) refer to as non-canonical grammar. But our data tell a different story about the importance of grammatical correctness in academic writing, as far as achieving publication is concerned. In Rozycki and Johnson (2013), a total of 142 instances of non-canonical grammar were found in a corpus of 14 research articles, that is to say, an average of about 10 per article. In our data, 1511 corrections were made in the 15 manuscripts (an average of over 100 per article) (see Table 1) before they were accepted for publication. The significance of the non-canonical grammatical features found in the research articles in Rozycki and Johnson’s (2013) study pales in comparison to the much larger correction efforts that the EAL scholars in the current study made prior to publication.

It may well be the case that editors and reviewers accept manuscripts that contain up to 10 non-standard grammatical features, especially when the merits of the research are exceptional, as in the case of the award-winning manuscripts studied
by Rozycki and Johnson (2013). But it is quite another matter to expect a manuscript with more than 100 grammatical irregularities, as is the case, on average, of the manuscripts in our study, to be published without some substantial editing. Therefore, it is premature to argue, as Rozycki and Johnson (2013, p. 166) did in their paper, that it might not be necessary for EAL authors to pay so much attention as they do now to grammatical issues or pay for editing services unless the journal editors or reviewers specifically make such requests. Indeed, we may also reconsider whether it is appropriate to embrace wholeheartedly the movement toward less emphasis on error correction for L2 writers’ academic texts as suggested, for example, by Jenkins (2013).

6.3.2. The issue of intelligibility

Intelligibility, as a key concept in both ELF and WE, is nevertheless difficult to define. There are a number of studies focused on spoken English (e.g., Deterding, 2012; Pickering, 2006; Smith and Nelson, 1985), but very little on written English. In her book on English in the International University, Jenkins (2013, p. 70), in a footnote, states that, when she is asked to examine a Ph.D. thesis from a university that claims to be international or global she “ignore[s] all intelligible non-native English in the thesis (emphasis added).” The term “intelligible” is a subjective one, however; what is intelligible to one person may be unintelligible to another. From the perspective of journal editors, this means that it is impossible to objectively judge if a manuscript is intelligible or not. How many non-standard features can be tolerated before a manuscript becomes unintelligible? And how much effort should readers be expected to put in to make a text become intelligible? This must necessarily be a subjective decision. Some editors have started to publish books which are written in ELF; Mauranen and Ranta (2009) is one well-known example. However, the editors of this edited collection state that all of the papers (which are written by L1 and L2 authors) “have been written by expert users of English” (p. 6, emphasis added), suggesting, perhaps, that only “expert” writers of ELF may be published internationally.

If, for them to become acceptable to editors and reviewers, the manuscripts of EAL scholars such as those in our study need to be revised substantially not just at surface level but, more importantly also in terms of linguistic content and meaning, as suggested by our findings,5 the ELF and WE movement toward less emphasis on error correction for L2 writers’ academic texts (e.g., Rozycki & Johnson, 2013) for scholarly publication, as already suggested, might perhaps not be embraced quite so wholeheartedly (from the point of view of the pragmatic editor, at least). While we totally agree with Jenkins (2013, p. 52) that “NNES writing might differ from that of expert NESs and still be considered expert,” it is the case, we would argue, that in our study, our writers are far from “expert.” This only serves to emphasize the difficulties of EAL scholars wishing to publish in international refereed journals referred to in the literature review of this article and elsewhere.

6.4. Pedagogical implications for EAP teachers and material writers

Achieving research publication in international journals, the great majority of which are published in English, is critically important for doctoral students and early career academics eager to launch their research careers. Meeting the expectations of editors and reviewers regarding the quality of language is a major concern for many of them. While classes in academic writing skills can be helpful in understanding the different issues at play, for example, with regard to genre, register, textual mentors, and language re-use (Flowerdew & Wang, in press), at the end of the day, doctoral students may still need to revise their manuscripts with the help of different shapers. As shown in this case study, the help of an author’s editor can be very important and substantial for improving the overall quality of a manuscript. For EAP teachers who may have such opportunities, it would be a good idea to become involved in the process of shaping and revising their manuscripts. By helping authors with shaping and revising their manuscripts, EAP teachers could have a deeper understanding of the problems that student writers have and would be able to teach their EAP courses more purposefully. Similarly, materials writers for English for research publication may benefit from collecting more data about how manuscripts are revised before publication, in order to prepare materials that are more specifically targeted towards the issues that EAL scholars typically contend with during revision. As suggested in our findings, grammatical correctness is an important issue during revision, but this may not be the only focus of author’s editors trying to help EAL scholars. More important in revising a manuscript is replacing words, phrases, or clauses/clause complexes with more appropriate ones to clarify authors’ meanings and to improve the cohesion as well as overall readability of the text, that is to say the category of substitution, the most frequent editing category in this study. The findings concerning substitution highlight a number of issues that deserve more pedagogical attention, including collocation, word choice, and use of abstract nouns, which are very important in academic writing (Flowerdew & Forest, 2015). Student writers may also find it helpful to study some cases of addition, deletion, and rearrangement through which more appropriate words are used, sentences are made more concise, and author’s meanings are clarified. In other words, the double-entry coding system developed in this study may serve as a useful heuristic for EAP teachers to discuss the process of revising manuscripts with student writers.

5 Over 70% of revisions changes in our study fall into this category (a finding which is consistent with that of Willey and Tanimoto’s (2015) latest study on “convenience editing” of abstracts that “content/meaning issues” are one of the three most frequent concerns of editors when revising (along with, for them, non-technical word usage and technical term usage).
6.5. Limitations of this study and direction for future studies

One major concern regarding the value of the present study is the fact that its data comes from a collection of manuscripts authored by Chinese scholars in science and engineering that have been edited by one author’s editor, whose first language is Chinese, and which contain a large number of features that require editing. This case study of how the author’s editor edited these manuscripts cannot be taken as representative of how EAL scholars’ manuscripts are typically revised by author’s editors. Writers from different backgrounds may present different challenges for author’s editors, and different author’s editors may take different approaches, prioritizing different features in the manuscripts they edit. The findings of the study are therefore not presented as a model of how to edit EAL scholars’ manuscripts for publication. Compared to previous studies, however, this study is the first systematic treatment of a set of authentic data, in the sense that all of the earlier versions of the manuscripts studied needed major revision and the final versions were all accepted for publication in SCI-indexed journals. The study thus offers a new perspective on revision changes that may serve as a baseline for future studies.

For such studies, more data may be collected from different sources, including authors and editors from different countries, language backgrounds, and disciplines in order to better understand how manuscripts may be revised before publication. Efforts may be made to collect data about how prominent editing services, such as that of large publishers, revise manuscripts without the opportunity to consult the original authors. By analyzing different sets of data on revision changes, it would be possible to compare the categories identified with those in the present study, which can then further inform the work of other author’s editors, EAP teachers, and materials writers. Finally, research studies may be conducted to better understand the causes of non-standard features and/or problems in the manuscripts and the intentions and reasons of the author’s editors for revising the ways they do.
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