Dear Maxim,

I wanted to catch up to you about the corrections that I made in the Omar documents. I believe I have corrected all of the mistakes that we identified.

But In looking over the output of the autobiography (document 4), I find I have a few more questions.

In no particular order –

1. I am mystified by the way that the comment numbers do not appear to follow any sequence of order. Looking at the text, the generated comment numbers appear in the following order: 63, 3, 6, 64, 65, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 46, 47 etc. do you have any idea why this would happen? This sequence corresponds to anchors numbered A1, A10, A11, A2, A3… That looks like an alphanumeric sequence that uses left to right order regardless of tens and hundreds. How would the anchors have to be renumbered to produce a standard numerical sequence?
2. There are over 800 variants generated. Most of these appear to be without any real difference between the diplomatic and standard versions. Do you understand what is happening here? It appears to happen if there is a different vowel mark or even a punctuation like a period. We could clean out all such marks or duplicate them on both lines to reduce the number of variants. Your thoughts?
3. I was surprised by the appearance of the notes in brackets which have a much larger font than the notes which are generated only by an endnote in the text. This makes me wonder whether I should drop the beginning note marker from these endnote references., so that they all look uniform in size in the output.
4. As I indicated to you previously, insert commands look ambiguous. They reverse the relation between standard edition and diplomatic edition. I am thinking of using the comment anchor for the following:
   1. author’s additions to a standard text. This places the addition only in the footnote to represent the diplomatic version.

syntax: #\*# Ann :: + XXX (addition) [in this example I wrote ‘Adds XXX’]

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

* 1. editor’s insertion of a word that was omitted from a standard text. The omitted word appears in the main text.

Syntax: #\*# Ann :: XXX (omitted) [or ‘Omits XXX’]

A picture containing diagram

Description automatically generated

* 1. editor’s addition of a word needed for grammatical or stylistic reasons. The necessary word appears in the main text

Syntax: #\*# Ann :: + XXX (ed.)

A picture containing diagram

Description automatically generated

in both of the latter two cases, the main text will reflect standard editions or preferred usage, instead of requiring the reader to read the footnote in order to discover the corrected text.

1. Is there any way to provide nonsequential section numbering? I have introduced break commands (BR) where the text requires divisions. These are marked in the form 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, etc., although one or two are out of sequence. I wonder if these numberings could be included on both the diplomatic and standard lines as plain text, in order to avoid generating a variant note. So line 180 would become:

A picture containing graphical user interface

Description automatically generated

would that work?