

Editorial Comment Policy

Use the clearest language possible when providing comments in the margins of the manuscript. These are addressed directly to the author for their consideration. Do not be accusatory, and do not assume they will make the changes. Use sensitive but sterile/technical language and include a brief reason so as to avoid bruising egos. You can include references to specific rules outlined in the CMoS. The editor may correct any and all punctuation, spelling, and grammatical errors. Cite the CMoS rule if you feel it is necessary, especially if it conflicts with the author's consistent style.

If an editor has questions or doubts about authorial style and what's permissible, consult the CMoS or other credible sources that suggest proper use. The typical rule is as long as the author is *wholly and completely* consistent throughout with a stylistic use of something (e.g., the German style of citing long passages or switching between French spelling, grammar, and punctuation and German spelling, grammar, and punctuation between chapters), then do not suggest revising. If they are not wholly and completely consistent, defer first to punctum then CMoS style. If these sources are not as granular as the occasion requires, then implement the most consistent formulation the author used.

To help ease egos while being as clear as possible when making margin comments, it might be helpful to set up a typology that distinguishes the tasks an editor is assigning the author. This might look like "question," "suggestion," "recommendation," and "bib/footnote." Note that in the following examples, the editor refers to the author as "Author." This depersonalizes the comment to lighten a potential blow. This doesn't have to be so rigid, but it can alleviate some anxiety for both parties in giving and receiving comments. Conditionals such as "might consider" also lighten the blow. However, when it comes to bibliographic information, the editor should always give their recommendation with "should."

- Use "Question" when asking for clarification in the text that cannot be resolved through suggesting or recommending revision.
 - E.g., "Question: does the antecedent "it" refer to X in the preceding sentence? If so, the Author might consider revising this for clarity."
 - E.g., "Question: what is the difference between "moralless and "moral-less"? Could "moralless" work here? "Moralless" is in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary."
- Use "Suggestion" when you are suggesting that an author *might* consider changing something in the text that is not a hard rule or a CMoS issue but a style issue.
 - E.g., "Suggestion: though sentence X is technically grammatical, the Author might consider revising this sentence into two sentences for the reader's ease."
- Use "Recommendation" when you are recommending that the author *should* revise something in the text that breaks a CMoS grammar rule.
 - E.g., "Recommend: the Author might rephrase for clarity."

- E.g., "Recommend: the Author might supply the citation for this obscure reference here. She/they/he might insert the full citation in the footnote and enter the essay in the Bibliography."
- e.g., "Recommend: the Author might consider revising this sentence with fewer parenthetical statements to ensure legibility and clarity. See CMOs rule 6.95: "Parentheses—stronger than a comma and similar to the dash—are used to set off material from the surrounding text. Like dashes but unlike commas, parentheses can set off text that has no grammatical relationship to the rest of the sentence" and "For the use of parentheses as delimiters for letters or numbers in a list or outline, see 6.129."
- e.g., "Recommend: the Author might revise/clarify/rephrase this sentence by breaking it into two. The thread of the sentence is tripping over the complex syntax."

Chapter Notes

- Highlight the chapter title, create comment, and write "Notes for the Author," or something like that. Keep track of consistent changes you make that you don't want to repeat through the text and cite the relevant CMOs rule. Keep track of relevant comments regarding the text. You might like to include a comment of something the author does well.
 - E.g.: Notes:
 1. When inconsistent with the rest of the text, I have altered the author's style of translation: e.g., *Lebenskraft* (vital matter); that is, the original German precedes the English translation in parentheses.
 2. In cases where the author has quoted from other works, the author should include any punctuation that precedes or follows the bracketed ellipses (e.g., "*is keeping the chasm ajar... The only other option*" should read "*is keeping the chasm ajar. [...] The only other option*," where the appropriate punctuation from the original text is included, and the ellipses, if they do not appear in the original, are bracketed.) Author should consider double checking these corrections to make sure the corrections are in line with the original texts. As well, quoted material can and should be consistent with the manuscript's author's syntax and punctuation, only as long as the quoted material maintains its original meaning.
 3. I have suggested moments where the Author could clarify the prose; for example, instances of over-complicated syntax and antecedent confusion. I have taken care not to adjust too much myself, but I have changed, for example, some gerunds to verbs and past participles used as adjectives to adjectives.
 4. I have recommended cuts for the less successful subsections. I do not make recommendations to cut on how much revision the subsection needs, though that might be the case at times. The cut sections should reflect in cuts from the table of contents and from the bibliography, if those works do not appear elsewhere. By "successful," I mean that
 1. the subsection can stand alone or is integral to the whole;

2. the subsection is well composed with a self-contained unifying thread or a broader, widely applying observation; or
3. the subsection adheres to few, but clear, references, each contributing to the subsection's main theme or observation.

Document Control

Document ID	POL-004
Document Owner	Vincent
Version	1.0
Last Date of Change	November 10, 2025
Next Review Due Date	
Version & Change Tracking	

Revision #4

Created 2025-11-10 07:04:30 UTC by Vincent

Updated 2025-11-10 07:11:34 UTC by Vincent