

Editorial and Manifest Guide

What this test copy contains, how it was verified, and how to review it

PURPOSE

This guide is part of the v1.8 editorial test library. It explains how to use the structure without treating the current proposal as irrevocable.

Test-copy facts

Source records	428
Physical PDFs	426
Identical duplicate records	2 - represented by one verified physical copy per pair
Different-content collision	1 - preserved using a deterministic source-folder suffix
Hash verification	426 copied PDFs verified with SHA-256; zero mismatches
Proposed folders	1,178 folders created in the editorial test library

Manifest files

- full_test_copy_report_v1.8.csv - one row per source record, with plan action, target, source hash, target hash, and copy status.
- document_reclassification_proposals_v1.8.csv - proposed primary path and classification status for each PDF.
- proposed_folders_v1.8.csv - the complete proposed folder inventory used to create the test tree.
- README.md - concise test-copy status and verification summary.

Editorial review checklist

- Sample each A-level and confirm that the named operating form matches its dependency level.
- Look for unqualified A2 names that should have an A1 manual, salvage, or historical form.
- Confirm that higher-level names state the dependency: industrial, electric, precision, municipal, networked, or frontier.
- Check that sanitation, medicine, electrical, pressure, chemical, and machinery content includes early safety and isolation knowledge.
- Check that every file appears only at a leaf and that cross-domain value is preserved through tags or related branches.
- Review collision and deduplication rows in the copy report.
- Record proposed changes as path mappings rather than moving source originals.

IMPORTANT

The Library folder is a test copy. The source.docs collection remains the provenance source and was not moved or altered. Editorial changes should update the proposal manifests and regenerate a new copy rather than editing provenance files in place.

Versioning recommendation

Treat v1.8 as an editorial candidate. Accumulate accepted path corrections, regenerate the proposal and PDFs, run collision and leaf checks, then produce a new hash-verified copy. Preserve the prior manifests so every classification change remains explainable.