Cross-check: where the reviews disagreed

Found in: Full manuscript review (appendix) · the same process sits behind every report

Your manuscript goes through several separate reviews. When they disagree, we don't average them. Each disputed claim is checked against your pages, and the report shows you where the reviews differed and how each difference was settled.

About these samples. Each example is a short excerpt from a real report we prepared for a client, used with the client's permission. To protect their privacy we changed character names, places and plot details that could identify the book, and each excerpt says what was changed. "[…]" marks a cut. Nothing was added to the findings.

The reports analyze the manuscript and suggest where things may be off. We don't write or rewrite any of the book. The writing stays entirely the author's.

EXAMPLE 1 · FROM A 2026 REPORT ON AN UPMARKET FAMILY DRAMA

📊 A note on the two reads

> This headline figure is a *reconciliation*, not a single instrument's verdict. Read purely at the sentence level — and judged, mistakenly, as a thriller — automated craft analysis rated this manuscript near **88/100**. A careful read of the whole *story*, attentive to plot logic and structure, scored it considerably lower. The **74** is where those two true-but-incomplete pictures meet: a beautifully written book with real structural work still to do. The full reconciliation — why the reads diverged and how it was settled against your own pages — is in **Appendix A**.

Excerpt from a real client report, shown as written (it names no characters or places). Used with permission.

EXAMPLE 2 · FROM A 2026 REPORT ON AN UPMARKET FAMILY DRAMA

A.2 Where the reads disagreed

The two complete reads diverged sharply, and not at random — the more favourable read was higher in every category, most dramatically on the story-logic categories where the more critical read found real problems. Here is the divergence, set beside the calibrated figure the report ultimately uses:

Category (and where it lives)	The more critical read	How the favourable read leaned	Calibrated final
Structure & Pacing (§2.2)	50	higher (~60)	**70** 🟡

Character Development (§2.3)	58	higher (~70)	**80** 🟢
Consistency & World-Building (§2.4)	40	higher	**65** 🔴
Line-Level Craft (§3)	55	markedly higher	**82** 🟢
Surface Polish (§4)	40	higher	**72** 🟡
Market Readiness (§6)	40	higher	**72** 🟡

Excerpt from a real client report, shortened ("[...]" marks cuts). It names no characters or places. Used with permission.

EXAMPLE 3 · FROM A 2026 REPORT ON AN UPMARKET FAMILY DRAMA

A.3 How the disagreements were adjudicated

Where the two reads differed by more than a handful of points, the disputed claim was not averaged — it was **checked against the manuscript itself.** The text was treated as the only authority that could break a tie. Two findings settled the weighting decisively:

🔍 **The more favourable read was caught being unreliable — twice over.**

- It described a **physical assault scene that does not occur anywhere in the manuscript.** It assessed, in part, a book that was not the one you wrote.
- It **overlooked 45 of the manuscript's own embedded editorial queries** — the prior-pass notes still live in the file — and so scored the book as more finished, and more internally settled, than it actually is.

✅ **The more critical read, by contrast, verified.** When its specific factual claims were spot-checked against the text — a naming inconsistency here, a broken plausibility link there, a rushed catastrophe at a named chapter — they held up at very nearly a hundred per cent. […]

🎯 **But — and this is the crucial second move — being right about the facts is not the same as being right about the score.** […] Once the verified findings are re-graded against the book's *actual* genre […], several of the harsh scores rise legitimately.

Excerpt from a real client report, shortened ("[...]" marks cuts). It names no characters or places. Used with permission.

EXAMPLE 4 · FROM A 2026 REPORT ON AN UPMARKET FAMILY DRAMA

B.1 The earlier editor's queries, reconciled (two of six clusters)

Cluster	What the embedded queries raise	Verdict	Status
A · Financial stakes	Why does the family's entire wealth hinge on one investment fund? If only one sister drew income from it, why is its freezing catastrophic for everyone?	✅ Agree	🔴 **Open** — the core problem; drives §2.4

E · Naming, motive & detail	Is the holding company *Harrow Investments* or *Harrow Securities*? When and why does a former partner resurface, and how can he access the money? Assorted consistency repairs	✅ Agree	🟡 **Open on the live items** — naming and access unresolved (§2.3, §2.4)

Excerpt from a real client report, shortened. Names and identifying details changed to protect privacy. Used with permission.