

Remaining Citation Issues

Citation Style Consistency

The document appears to follow Harvard citation style consistently, with in-text citations formatted as (Author, Year) and a comprehensive references list at the end. The references are properly formatted with author, publication year, title, publisher, and where applicable, URLs and access dates.

Potential Citation Issues

1. **Self-referential citations:** The document frequently cites some of the same sources repeatedly, particularly Marx and Engels (1848), Mills (1951), and Weber (1978). While not necessarily problematic, over-reliance on certain sources might indicate a need for more diverse references.
2. **Recent web sources:** Many citations are dated 2023 (like [Encyclopedia.com](#), Britannica, Reddit, Wikipedia), suggesting they are contemporary web sources rather than historical scholarly works. For an academic monograph on historical topics, primary sources or established historical scholarship might be more appropriate in some instances.
3. **Wikipedia citations:** The document cites Wikipedia multiple times. While Wikipedia has improved in reliability, many academic standards discourage direct citation of Wikipedia as a source.
4. **Social media citations:** There appears to be a Reddit citation ("How did early wealthy merchants/burghers/capitalists in Europe refer to themselves?"). Social media sources generally require careful consideration in academic writing.

Recommendations

Without access to the full document to compare all in-text citations with the reference list, I cannot definitively identify missing citations. However, I would recommend:

1. Reviewing all factual claims, especially historical ones, to ensure they are properly supported by citations
2. Reducing reliance on encyclopedia and web sources in favor of primary sources and peer-reviewed literature where possible
3. Reconsidering the use of Wikipedia and social media as direct sources
4. Ensuring that all cited works in the text appear in the references and vice versa

The document appears to be a draft (marked as "Revised Version with Formatting Corrections"), suggesting it's still undergoing review, which would be an appropriate time to address these potential citation issues.

**