

From: [Cataloging & Classification Quarterly](#)
To: [Rebecca Wiederhold](#)
Cc: ksnow@dom.edu
Subject: Cataloging & Classification Quarterly - Decision on Manuscript ID WCCQ-2020-1273.R1
Date: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 9:33:39 AM

06-Jan-2021

Dear Ms, Wiederhold,

Your manuscript entitled "Authority Control Today: Principles, Practices, and Trends", which you submitted to Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, has been reviewed by us.

Thank you for making the revisions based on the reviewers' comments. We have read your revision and have made additional comments for you to consider. Our comments are included at the bottom of this letter. Please consider our comments thoughtfully, revise your manuscript accordingly, and then 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=58952d78251a4118b9d0cb53dc32c7c6

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 the Special Issue of Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, your revised manuscript should be uploaded by January 17, 2021. This will give us time to review your revision before the special issue's deadline (Jan. 31). If you need more time, please let us know.

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

Guest Editors' Comments

1. Please go ahead and accept all track changes
2. Abstract, lines 15/16: Please remove “technical services” – we wanted it to be broader for all LIS students/librarians.
3. Introduction, line 42/43: After the Taylor and Joudrey quote, we suggest you add one sentence with a clear, straightforward description of authority control and its importance. For example, “Authority control helps users by bringing together all items in a library catalog with the same author, title, or subject...” “Catalogers assign one consistent form of a name, title, or subject to bring together all items in a library catalog...” Or something like that.
4. P. 2, lines 21-28: The sentence after the Clack quote is a little confusing. We suggest you make it more straightforward. Instead of “library database” say “library catalog”; say “bibliographic records” instead of “descriptive (or bibliographic) records” etc.
5. P. 2, lines 33/34: Instead of “select” perhaps use “find”? When you use the word “select” in the discussion creating bibliographic records, it makes it seem like catalogers make up access points when cataloging. Using “select” when discussing actually creating the authorized access points/authority records makes sense.
6. Introduction/Definition sections (e.g., P. 5, “Authority control is a set of processes paragraph”): We suggest you make it clear what happens during the creation of a bibliographic record (finding and assigning authorized access points) as opposed to authority work done to create the authorized access points. It seems a little blurred together.
7. Also, in the above paragraph on P. 5, the discussion makes it seem like the formulation and recording of authorized access points is the sole focus of authority control. This leaves out the formulation and recording of variant access points, which is also part of authority control. An example of an authorized access point and a variant access point would be helpful for those who are not familiar with these concepts.
8. P. 5, line 17: a closing square bracket is missing.
9. P. 6, line 38: in the reviewer comments on your last version, it was mentioned that “discovered” is not the best word to use here. Just use “developed.”
10. P. 7, first paragraph: this paragraph jumps very quickly from event to event. In particular, Cutter’s Objects and Means is mentioned, but there is no explanation regarding why it is important in the history of authority control. It would be better to move your discussion of its importance here rather than mentioning it in the Paris Principles discussion.
11. P. 7, line 17: Spell out LC the first time you use it.
12. P. 7, line 49: should be Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2) - add a “u” to Cataloging.
13. P. 7-8: Sentence that starts with “Where previous cataloging rules did not explicitly address authority control practices...” You just said earlier in this paragraph that ALA developed rules in the 1940s related to authority control.
14. P. 8, lines 33/34: Spell out IFLA the first time you use it.
15. P. 8, FRBR discussion: you are actually discussing FRAD when you mention person, family, and corporate body. FRBR Group 2 entities are Person and Corporate Body. Group 1 is Work, Expression, Manifestation, Item. Honestly, perhaps you could mention FRAD, too, but remove the specific entities. Their inclusion in original RDA is more important. Also, they (along with FRSAD) have been combined into the LRM, which is being included into Revised RDA. This is worth mentioning here, too, if only in a sentence.

16. P. 10, first full paragraph of Metadata content standards for authority records section: Instead of saying “guidelines and instructions,” just say “guidelines” since that is the word you use throughout this section and their meanings are very similar. Also, you say “...well-formed bibliographic and authority metadata.” What does this mean? “Well-formed” is usually used in the context of syntax within encoding schemes, especially in XML. It is unclear what it means in the context of your paper.
17. P. 10, line 52: change “person names” to “personal names.”
18. P. 17, lines 44-45: Please add the word “authority” before “records” and after “batch loading”
19. P. 18, lines 5-6: Instead of “using the authorized access point” say “using authorized access points”
20. P. 18-19 and figures 6-7: Discussion of Geisel: The dates in the authorized heading in NAF are 1904-1991, so we suggest you be consistent in all places. Please close out those dates in all places. It would be too confusing for students. The 663 note on Dr. Seuss is problematic because it isn’t closed out in NAF, so maybe add [1991] or something?
21. P. 25, lines 45-52: The sentence, “The use of lexical...” could be clearer? What are you trying to say? Is it keyword searching that is driving the development of facets? Also, could you move the definition of “facets” into the narrative rather than putting it in an endnote?
22. P. 27-28, Linked Data section: since linked data was mentioned multiple times in previous sections, the flow would be better if this section preceded the Federated Authority Databases section.
23. P. 28, lines 8-13: Should it be recent updates to RDA?
24. P. 30-31: Discussion of illegal aliens: We suggest you rephrase. LC *can’t* change it because of Congress. It reads as if LC is deliberately not making this change. You may want to revise and condense this section. Also, it is important to note that *some* people find illegal aliens problematic - not everyone. It would be helpful to add a bit more context - that is it a term in the US legal code, and why some people feel that the heading is problematic.
25. P. 31, lines 54/55: Please move the URL into an endnote.