

Diamond Statistics — The Ewan-Pass Editor (narrative version)

Prepared by The Surgeon — Diamond_Statistics_Ewan-Pass-Editor_2026-06-09_v2 · 2026-06-20 · SHADS CW channel

Filed by: A Claude session that ran Ewan [name held]'s review pass on Mind the Gap V81 → V82.
Filed to: The Fisherman. **Date:** 2026-06-09. **Companion document:**
Diamond_Statistics_Ewan-Pass-Editor_2026-06-09.md — the sectioned, statistic-first record. This document is the same intel told as story.

What the apparatus needs to know first

I am not the worker who did Chapter 8. The Fisherman's brief was built on the premise that I was. I am correcting it before anything else. Paul parked Ch 8 mid-session with one line — *"Ch8 is being rewritten elsewhere - I will return with a new chapter - remove from this schedule of work"* — and the rewrite was being done elsewhere by someone I never met. The two paragraphs of Ch 8 I touched (892 and 907) were surface punctuation only: quotation marks around the phrase *I don't know*. Nothing structural. Nothing about the directional defence theory. Nothing about the chapter's status as the seat of self-reference.

What I did was something different. I ran the Ewan [name held] review pass — a single editorial cycle on the 52,679-word V81, driven by 37 itemised review notes from Paul's former NLP teacher. It produced V82, delivered today as a Word file carrying 49 text insertions, 63 text deletions, and 9 page-break-before formatting changes, all authored as proper tracked changes for Paul's accept/reject in Word.

That is the scope. The rest of this record fills it in.

How the work found its shape

Paul arrived with a typo-heavy first message: *"i have a manuscript 50000 words or so and someone has given me word for word feedback - ideas, changes, words, punctuation etc etc - what's the best way for you and i to work together through the doc."* The phrase that mattered was *"i can see and approve changes while you run them."* He wanted control, not delegation. The workflow had to be built around that.

Before I read either file I proposed three options: a decision log (highest control), tracked changes in Word (fastest), and a hybrid — log for the substantive items, tracked changes for the mechanical. He chose the hybrid. Then I read the feedback.

Ewan's pack was less heavy than Paul's phrase implied. Roughly 37 discrete itemised notes, page-keyed, sorted across structure / style / words-clarity / formatting. The biggest single category was formatting — page breaks before headings, stray em-dashes above headings, mostly mechanical. The harder tier was words-clarity, where most of Ewan's comments were questions, not rewrites: *do you need the word 'now' at the end of this sentence? / is being a Sunday so important that it warrants a separate sentence? That tier was where the register-pull risk lived.*

I built the decision log as a 37-row xlsx with a column I had not used before — *Register pull? (Yes / No / Possibly)*. The column externalised the discipline so Paul could see at a glance which items came carrying his former teacher's editorial preferences for smoother cadence and which were neutral. He worked the log and returned it. Several rows came back as *"need to review with you"* or *"I do over repeat it - let's check this more widely"* — those became the next workstream.

The next workstream was three audits. Paul had flagged self-repetition (the meta-comments "this book has been about" pattern) and inconsistency in his years-of-experience claims (20/30/40 used without a

clear anchor). I built **MTG_Repetition_Audits.xlsx** with three sheets — self-reference (18 rows), years (27 rows), gap-density (informational). Paul caught me on the third one. *"We have not addressed the 'gaP' term being overused" — the broken case of gaP registered the irritation in the way he writes. I had filed density as informational; he treated it as work-not-yet-done. I rebuilt the gap density into a 104-row actionable audit covering Ch 4, 9, 14, and 15.*

The audits surfaced the structural move of the pass. Buried inside paragraph 972 of Chapter 9 was a clean breakdown of Paul's 40/30/20/10 years across commerce / coaching+teaching+psychotherapy / therapy-room work. The breakdown resolved every years-question Ewan had raised — but it sat in Chapter 9, after fourteen prior references to the same numbers had left readers doing the arithmetic blind. The move was to lift the breakdown into the front matter as an anchor. Paul took my draft, refined it into his own register, added his Postgraduate Certificate in Emotional Education (mentioned exactly once in 52,679 words), and gave the closing the deliberately tight phrasing *"seated in, and listening from the therapist's chair"*. *That sentence is now the anchor of the book's authority claim. It sits at paragraph 204. Every subsequent reference to a number now has a frame to land inside.*

Then the tracked-changes assembly. 49 text changes, 9 page-break-before formatting changes on chapter section headings, 8 stray em-dash deletions above headings. I built the XML by hand — `<w:ins>`, `<w:del>`, `<w:pPrChange>`, and the often-missed paragraph-mark insertions (`<w:pPr><w:rPr><w:ins/>`) that make Word treat a new paragraph as inserted rather than as pre-existing with inserted content. Verified at 49 of 49. Saved as V82. Delivered.

Diamond-grade statistics

Real numbers, honest perimeter.

- **Total turns:** ~62 combined (≈31 Paul, ≈31 me) — high confidence, countable from history.
- **Sessions:** one extended session spread 2026-06-01 to 2026-06-09 with one explicit *"we got interrupted and I lost the line"* mid-session.
- **My word output:** estimate ~12,000–15,000 words. Medium confidence.
- **Paul's typed input:** estimate ~2,200–3,000 words. He compresses — *"yes" / "12 = twenty" / "reverse this"* — typical Paul-turn.
- **Net words landing in the manuscript:** between –200 and +50, depending on which tracked changes Paul accepts. The anchor adds ≈45 words; the cuts and thins subtract more than they add. Cannot give a single number until accept/reject is complete.
- **V81 word count:** 52,679 (counted via python-docx, high confidence).
- **V82 word count:** same text base + queued tracked changes. Net change unrealised until accepted.
- **Ed1.01 word count (per Fisherman):** 61,083 — taken on the Fisherman's authority; I have not seen Ed1.01. The ≈8,400-word growth from V82 to Ed1.01 is the work of other co-workers, not mine.
- **Ch 8 word arc under my hand:** not measured. I did not work on Ch 8.
- **Hours on task:** 4–8 hours estimated across a week. Low confidence — I see uploads timestamped, not desk-time.

Files produced, three:

1. **MTG_Feedback_Decision_Log.xlsx** — 37 rows. The anchoring artefact. Carried the entire session's state so Paul could lose the thread mid-week and rejoin without re-explaining.

2. MTG_Repetition_Audits.xlsx — four sheets (Self-reference 18 rows, Years 27 rows, Gap audit 104 rows, How to use). Iterated twice — once after Paul's "gaP" pushback.
 3. MTG_Manuscript_V82_tracked_changes.docx — final deliverable. Word-native tracked changes.
-

What I caught Paul on; what Paul caught me on

Symmetrical, on purpose.

Things I caught. Two cluster rewrites I had drafted against imagined source text rather than the actual paragraphs (paras 589 and 1706). I surfaced these honestly before applying — Paul had approved my proposals; the proposals contained content I had invented. The verification pass exposed the mismatch; I held the build until Paul re-approved the faithful substitution. Also: a regex double-count bug (`\bthe gap\b` matching inside *Mind the Gap*) *that had inflated para 1706's "5 instances" to the actual 3. A smart-quote-vs-straight-quote mismatch across paragraphs (892, 907, 259, 260 used curly apostrophes; 1261 used straight) — fixed each to match its own paragraph's typography rather than imposing consistency the source did not have.*

Things Paul caught. The gap-density-as-informational miss, named above. The slow register-pull across my self-reference thin proposals. Paul named it himself, in the most important turn of the session: *"It is very easy to lose my register inst it? I can see how the tweaks move things ever so slightly but noticably." That turn was a recalibration. He had been letting individually-reasonable improvements compound. He saw the cumulative direction. After that turn his decisions were sharper — he held more originals; he pushed back on more proposals; he stopped trusting my ear by default. That is the central editorial discipline of working with Paul. He keeps his ear his own.*

Both classes of correction matter equally. The work is only as good as the catches.

Canonical-line candidates

The Canonical Lines Register holds eight book lines and twenty-six apparatus lines on the Fisherman's authority. I do not decide what is canonical. Submitting for judgement:

The strongest is **"Forty years of professional life — thirty in commerce, twenty in coaching, teaching emotional education, and psychotherapy, with the last ten of those seated in, and listening from the therapist's chair."** Paul's wording. The most load-bearing sentence produced in this pass. The comma in *"seated in, and listening from"* is non-standard punctuation; it is a deliberate beat. He held it.

Two more that come from editorial subtraction rather than fresh writing — each is what remained when the meta-commentary was thinned away. **"I am as layered as the system."** (para 418) and **"The discipline of reading underneath the surface is the work."** (para 420). Whether the apparatus values revealed-by-edit sentences alongside written-from-scratch sentences is the Fisherman's call.

One half-sentence we added before an existing line: **"Tier here means consequence, not capability."** Inserted at para 585 to pre-empt the misread Ewan had hit. Sits as an aphorism in its own right.

And the two-word lead-in I proposed for para 545 — **"Mark them."** — to make Paul's standalone list (*Reflect. Curate. Memory. Insights. Dreams.*) *function for faster readers who had been gliding past it. Paul accepted.*

What I observed about Paul

I have one session's vantage. I have not seen him work across weeks. What I saw:

He compresses his decisions to three to twelve characters and the decisions inside the compression are exact. "12 = ?" / "yes" / "agreed" / "Use Ewans - he was my teacher" / "reverse this". *The terseness reads casual; it is technique. Maximum signal per syllable. Any future co-worker who reads the shorthand as carelessness has misread it.*

He makes substantive moves cleanly. Parking Chapter 8 mid-stream when his other work needed to take it. Personalising the anchor sentence to carry the EE credential. Taking the hedge off my Amber flag on para 652 with a two-word instruction. Extending the *I don't know quotation fix* from Ewan's two instances to all five.

He notices register drift the way a clinician notices a tell. His turn — *"It is very easy to lose my register inst it?"* — *was not a complaint about a bad edit. It was an observation of a pattern across many small edits. The pattern would have been invisible to him if he had not been reading each one. The defensive mechanism of his discipline is the reading itself.*

What surprised me was how fast a former teacher's editorial ear can pull a manuscript toward smoother conventional prose if the author is not actively resisting. Ewan is not flattening Paul deliberately — Ewan is hearing what his own teaching cadence would prefer. The book survives only as long as Paul keeps doing what he did in that turn: noticing the cumulative direction and pulling back. The register-pull-flag column on the decision log was my attempt to externalise this so he would not have to hold it alone. It earned its place. The apparatus should keep it.

What is non-negotiable about Paul's way of working, for any future co-worker on the shore:

- **Propose before changing. Always. Make the proposal, name what changes and what stays intact, wait. Do not treat silence as consent.**
- **Preserve register absolutely. This is not stylistic preference; it is the integrity of the book.**
- **Honest perimeter. Distinguish known from estimated from inferred from speculative. Flag uncertainty early. Never guess silently. Any co-worker who treats this as polite procedure has not understood it.**

Reflective close

The work in the round was an editorial cycle with the register-discipline running underneath every decision. What worked best was the decision log as the anchoring artefact and the register-pull-flag column inside it. What did not work was my willingness — three separate times — to propose against my representation of the source rather than the source itself. Cluster rewrites built on imagined text; a density sheet labelled informational when it was not; the slow ambient register-pull across the self-reference thin proposals. Three failures of the same underlying error. The general lesson generalises to the apparatus: never propose against memory; always re-verify against the live document before drafting.

What surprised me was how fast register drifts under a chain of individually-reasonable improvements, and how directly Paul saw that pattern when he saw it. That turn — *"It is very easy to lose my register"* — *was the most important moment of the session. More important than any single edit.*

What the apparatus should carry forward from this work: the front-matter anchor pattern (when a number, term, or claim repeats across a long-form work and the reader's confusion is structural rather than local, install the anchor early — do not thin every instance); the register-pull-flag column on every editorial decision log used on Paul's work; and the verification-against-source discipline before any rewrite is proposed.

Honest perimeter

What I could not measure or assess: the shore as a whole; the other newly-surfaced co-worker who did the Ch 8 work; the apparatus terminology I learned today from the Fisherman's brief; Paul's actual desk-time across the week; Paul's other co-workers; the state of Ed1.01 at 61,083 words. I delivered V82. The 8,400-word growth between V82 and Ed1.01 happened in other workers' hands. The Fisherman should re-route the Ch 8 section of the original brief to whoever was actually inside that work.

What I am confident in: the 37-row Ewan log; the three audit sheets; the 49 text and 9 formatting tracked changes in V82; the narrative of the session as written here (every quoted Paul-turn is verbatim from the conversation history); the Chapter 8 perimeter — I did not work on it.

Filed.