

From: [Cataloging & Classification Quarterly](#)
To: [Rebecca Wiederhold](#)
Cc: ksnow@dom.edu
Subject: Cataloging & Classification Quarterly - Decision on Manuscript ID WCCQ-2020-1273
Date: Monday, November 23, 2020 3:29:03 PM
Attachments: [WCCQ-2020-1273 Proof hi with Reviewer comments and edits.pdf](#)

23-Nov-2020

Dear Ms Wiederhold:

Your manuscript entitled "Authority Control Today: Principles, Practices, and Trends", which you submitted to Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, has been reviewed. The reviewer comments are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewers would like to see some revisions made to your manuscript before publication. In addition, because of the scope of the special issue and its focus on presenting targeted introductions, we also have made some comments. Please consider our comments and both reviewer's comments thoughtfully, revise your manuscript accordingly, and let us know briefly how you have chosen to address (or not address) each of the questions or concerns. (ScholarOne provides a place for you to insert your response when you submit a revision.)

When you revise your manuscript please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text.

To submit the revision, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/wccq> and enter your Author Center. Click on the purple 'Click here to submit a revision' link to start the revision process. If you have more than one manuscript awaiting revision, this will take you to a list of those papers and you can click on the 'Create a Revision' link for the paper you want to revise. Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision. Please enter your responses to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you made to the original manuscript. Please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

Alternatively, once you have revised your paper, it can be resubmitted to Cataloging & Classification Quarterly by way of the following link:

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/wccq?URL_MASK=48512f37079148e5a0b1767dc59d780f

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Cataloging & Classification Quarterly and we look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Hoffman & Karen Snow, Guest Editors
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly

ghoffman@twu.edu
ksnow@dom.edu

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

The article does a fine job of providing a basic introduction to authority control. My comments are primarily editorial and minor.

page 3 - suggest "from handwritten tablets, indexes, and manuscripts to published books and files of index cards."
[add comma after "indexes"]

The section explaining main entry is a bit loose. Card sets once consisted of the main entry, which had full information about the item, and added entries, which had an added index term at the top followed by an abbreviated version of the the main entry card. The user was advised to see the main entry card for full information. "Main entry" came to mean the primary filing information, usually author and title, for the main entry card. As reproduction technology improved, every card in the set could be produced with the full description once found only on the main entry card. [That may be more detail than is desirable in a basic summary.]

page 4 - suggest moving (e.g., acquisitions ... discovery) to follow "functions", which these are examples of.

page 5 - suggest "Cataloging involves description of the informtion resource and subject analysis for content access and classification to determine the resource's location, what the item is about, and to bring together other related resources." [dropping comma, adding "and" and "to"]

page 6 - suggest "Figure two shows a MARC authority record for a person entity. It illustrates how each piece ..."
Change sentence beginning "5XX tags ..." to "Tags coded 5XX ..."
suggest "... fixed field data to identify information about the record itself and metadata useful for filtering results, including the type ... can be used, and the language and publication date of the resource."

page 8 - "three decades ago, stating, "In order ..." [add comma before quote; or change to "stating that "In order ..."]
add comma after "... additional contributors, etc.)"
change order of "chosen heading to ..." to "heading chosen to ..."

page 9 - change to "... a link is created to the authority and indexed in the system along with links from variant references and from related entries defined in the authority record."
change to "... record for Apple, Inc. includes a link from Steve Jobs as the founder of the corporate body (see Figure 3) to Apple, Inc."

The point here is that while readers mayu suppose that the authority record is a kind of knowledge card pointing out from the authorized term to other points in the catalog, it's more properly understood as a way of placing pointers elsewhere in the catalog that point back to the authorized term in the 1XX. This logic is the primary protection against blind references in the catalog, which the knowledge card approach risks generating.

page 11 - "if a heading matches the 1XX or 4XX from an authoirty record, the authorized form will be inserted into the bibliographic record ..." It might be worth adding here "(This automated matching process sometimes requires human oversight to detect and correct false matches.)"

page 12 - suggest moving "both" from "to both be found" to "to allow for both books and related" to avoid the split infinitive.

Footnotes 22 and 23 run together. Could the footnote describing finding aids move to follow "finding aid" in the line above?

page 13 - change to "Information retrieval ... also relies .." [not "rely"]

page 15 - change to " ... works, expressions, and bibliographic titles." [add final s]

suggest "... it provides a hub for bringing together the various authorized forms and identifiers of an entity in a single location..."

suggest "... Adding the unique identifiers from Wikidata to a library authority file ..." or ""Adding the unique Wikidata identifier to a library authority record ..."

suggest "This service allows ...and provides ..," [instead of "as well as provide"]

page 17 - change "judgement" to "judgment"?

page 18 - change to "set of initiatives and grants represents ..." [not "represent"]

Figure 3 caption - suggest noting that the 3XX tags now also include many attributes of the entity.

Figure 7 - This figure illustrates the knowledge card approach to displaying authorities discussed above. More standard authority practice would be to use the Apple, Inc. authority to point users from Jobs, Wozniak, and Apple Computer, Inc to Apple, Inc. Could both approaches be illustrated?

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

Please see the PDF file for comments and edits.

A concise and clear definition of authority control is missing.

As well, you seem to conflate cataloging with MARC, which is a mistake. This is evidenced by the lack of any discussion of cataloging rules or guidelines such as AACR2 or RDA. MARC is simply an encoding mechanism, one of many metadata schemas we could use.

Overall, the introduction and first part of the paper are weak. I suggest that you look at Clack or Maxwell's textbooks on authority control.

When using Figures in a paper they should be referred to in order--you do not do this. I suggest you renumber the figures in the order that you refer to them in the text.

Guest Editors' Comments

Thank you for submitting your paper. Please pay attention to the Reviewers' comments and please address their concerns. Here we will mention things not necessarily commented on by the reviewers.

1. Please remove the running head.

2. For each table and figure, you need to add a callout on a separate line in your manuscript. This way the production team knows exactly where you want the figure or table. And as mentioned by Reviewer 2, please call them out in order. See here: https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/tf_quick_guide/

3. The paper would benefit from the inclusion of more examples. This can be done without reference to MARC and authority records. The "Authority control defined" section is the perfect place to include some of these examples. You can provide examples of personal names, series, subject headings, etc. Please include specific examples

throughout the paper.

4. Throughout the manuscript, you use words from AACR2, like entries, headings, main entry, etc. It would be helpful if the first time you used each one, you explained to students what these phrases mean and where they come from.

5. The Introduction needs to be fleshed out more. Instead of waiting until page 4 to define “authority control,” we recommend that you begin the paper with a definition. Also, please put authority control in the overall context of cataloging and bibliographic records, and be very clear and straightforward about why authority control is important (e.g., collocation and differentiation), and how it helps patrons. Also, please add the phrase “authorized access points” somewhere, and please mention some of the standards used to create access points, such as Resource Description and Access, the Library of Congress Subject Headings, etc.

6. Top of page 2 - remember that the audience of the papers in this issue is not just practitioners, so consider modifying the statement that singles out catalog librarians as beneficiaries of authority control knowledge.

7. At the end of your introduction, explain what you’re going to do in the paper. You do this in the abstract, but you also need to include this information in your introduction.

8. p. 2 - second paragraph of the “History of authority control” section - you begin using the term “headings” but do not explain what that is. Since this paper may be read by someone with little background knowledge of cataloging, we recommend you define “heading.”

9. P. 2, line 7: We suggest you do not call a library catalog a register. A register is a different type of retrieval tool.

10. P. 2, line 9: We suggest you take out the word “discovered” - cataloging principles were not discovered, but they were developed.

11. p. 2, line 44 - capitalize “Objects and Means”

12. P. 3-4: You use the word “analog” quite a bit, which is accurate, but may be a little confusing for students. Perhaps “physical” would be a better choice? Or another word?

13. p. 3, line 42 - explain what is meant by “bibliographic and authority metadata.” Once again, those who have little background knowledge of cataloging may be reading this paper and may not understand what this means.

14. p. 3, line 52 - explain what is meant by “authority records”

15. p. 4, line 17 - “authorized headings” - try to be as consistent as possible when using terminology. Earlier, you used “authorized terms,” “preferred terms,” and “uniform headings” that seemingly refer to the same concept. Referencing standards would help as well.

16. The “History of Authority Control” section starts off strong with discussions of Panizzi, Cutter, and Lubetzky (though more could be said on how their work helped shape our idea of authority control). However, the section lapses into a discussion of the technological evolution of cataloging and veers away from the authority control focus. We recommend that you cut back on the card catalog and MARC discussion and instead focus more on standards (such as the ALA rules from 1949, AACR, AACR2, and RDA) that dictate how to construct access points that are typically under authority control. Subject controlled vocabularies, such as LCSH, are also under authority control.

17. p. 4 - As mentioned previously, the appearance of the “Authority control defined” section feels out-of-place so far into the paper. This section should precede the history section.

18. p. 4 - the definition provided of “authority control” is too simplified. We recommend consulting Clack and Maxwell, as suggested by Reviewer #2, as well as Joudrey & Taylor textbooks and Chan & Salaba.

19. p. 4, lines 52-54 - “The library and its staff are in the business of acquiring, processing, maintaining...” - this is

debatable. First of all, it would be best to not use the word “business” because most libraries are not businesses. Also, one could argue that we are actually “in the business” of meeting the information needs of our users and that acquiring, processing, maintaining, and circulating resources are ways we help meet those needs.

20. p. 5, line 35 - instead of saying “i.e.” (in other words) and then listing out the many entity types that some readers may not understand (such as “expressions”), use “e.g.” (for example) and then list a few examples.

21. p. 5, line 42 - it is important to be clear that authority records may not exist for every authorized access point.

22. P. 5: It would be helpful to show an example of a bibliographic record with the access points highlighted so that readers would understand what you are talking about.

23. p. 6, line 5 - “variant forms (i.e. synonyms)...” since names are also under authority control, it is awkward to refer to variant forms of a personal name as “synonyms” of the preferred name.

24. Page 6: We agree with Reviewer 2 about your discussion about MARC. Although describing an authority record encoded in MARC is helpful, you should also mention standards such as RDA and LCSH. Authority information is more important than the encoding scheme.

25. Page 7: Although authorized names and titles are controlled, they are not necessarily considered a controlled vocabulary in the same way that subject headings lists, like LCSH, and thesauri, like Art & Architecture Thesaurus, are controlled vocabulary.

26. Page 7: You mention local authority files here for the first time, but perhaps it would be better to discuss authority files overall? National and local?

27. Page 10, lines 1-2: You unintentionally make it seem as if NACO and SACO have their own databases of authority records, but everyone uses the same Library of Congress Authority file. This is related to the previous comment.

28. p. 11, lines 22-24 - explain “Library of Congress Names and Subjects.” Do you mean the LC Authority File?

29. P. 13: Why did you mention DACS and not RDA? :)

30. p. 16-17, Ethical authority control section - this section could easily be expanded. This is an important topic. Include more specific examples. For example, please discuss the ethical issues, not that particular Sandberg monograph. Also, there are lots of ethical issues related to subjects.

31. p. 17, lines 38-49 - cite the website of this committee

32. P. 17, 2nd line from bottom: This is the first time you mention differentiation, and it’s an important concept that should be discussed much earlier in the paper.

33. p. 18, Into the future section - As opposed to focusing on BIBFRAME, which is in no way close to replacing MARC at this point, perhaps focus more on how linked data will impact authority control. Since you already brought up linked data in the Issues and Trends section, re-think the organization of the content.

34. p. 19, line 10 - “standard identifiers” - give an example.

35. p. 19, line 15 - “identity management” - what is this and how does it relate to authority control? This is an important phrase and it is the first time you’ve brought it up. Perhaps you want to define and use it at the beginning of your issues and trends section?

36. P. 19, Conclusion: Your conclusion really isn’t a conclusion. It would probably be better at the beginning of your paper. You really shouldn’t add a new figure in the conclusion. It’s a fine figure, but maybe introduce it earlier? We suggest you add a different conclusion that sums up what you discussed in this paper.

37. Footnote 1: Be sure to add the page number of the quote. Also, please make sure that each direct quote (those in quotation marks) has a footnote with the particular page number of the quote.