

WIDEN THE ROOM BEFORE APPROVAL DAY

Turn one note into an approved diff, then check the outgoing draft from independent angles

A note is not permission for a general rewrite. Tie each change to a cited passage, a numbered proposal, and the writer's recorded decision. Before approval, use only the independent reads a person can inspect. *Anything set as dialogue is an instruction you can give the agent word for word; adapt filenames, lenses, and constraints to the production.*

PREPARED FOR THE AVS SCREENWRITING TEAM · JULY 2026

FADE IN:

ONE NOTE, ONE RECORDED DECISION

Late surprises often begin when a broad note becomes a broad rewrite. Keep diagnosis, proposal, approval, and application separate so the writer can protect voice, inspect each choice, and see whether the change solves the note without causing new problems.

Rule 1: One note per pass. Limit the pass to one concern so the writer can read the result of one controlled change.

Rule 2: Voice decisions remain in PROPOSE. APPLY may make only the exact changes the writer approved.

Rule 3: The writer approves numbered items, not a sweeping rewrite. Record each accepted item and its rationale.

“Mechanical” describes permission, not importance. Formatting can move pagination; a dictated trim can weaken a setup. After the writer approves exact wording, APPLY may insert it but may not make new choices. If wording, emphasis, rhythm, or implication remains open, keep the file unchanged and return to PROPOSE.

- 1. File the note before interpreting it.** Copy it verbatim into `projects/return-visit/revision-pass-log.md`. Record source, date, stage, draft, and pages in the canonical PDF. Name one concern and the story-bible constraints it must preserve. Notes requiring different judgments get separate passes.
- 2. Diagnose what the note touches.** Begin with impact, not solutions:

The Writer
(to the agent)

ASK only. Read the pacing note in `projects/return-visit/revision-pass-log.md` against `projects/return-visit/draft-4.pdf`, `projects/return-visit/story-bible.md`, and `rubrics/committee.md`. Limit the response to this note. List affected scenes, promises, and continuity facts. For each, cite the PDF page and relevant story-bible or rubric section; state uncertainty and source conflicts. Do not propose changes or edit files.

You should get: this note's impact list, with page and section citations, uncertainty, and conflicts. Next: confirm the constraints.

- 3. Request numbered options.** This exposes unrelated edits:

The Writer
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. From `projects/return-visit/revision-pass-log.md`, preview one numbered revision per affected passage in `projects/return-visit/draft-4.pdf`. Quote and cite each; show the change, reason, effect, and preserved story-bible constraints, including reveal and midpoint. Change no files.

You should get: numbered passages, not rewritten pages. Next: approve, request revision, defer, or reject each.

- 4. Make the writer's decision explicit.** Approve only items that solve the note in the production's voice. If the passage is right but the language is wrong, request a revised item. Defer other-pass work and reject changes to intentional choices. Record each decision and reason in

`projects/return-visit/revision-pass-log.md`. Approval covers the numbered wording shown, nothing broader.

REVISION PASS LOG

PASS 07 *pacing · pp. 12–18*

Approved *items 2, 4*

Deferred *item 1 · separate continuity pass*

Rejected *item 3 · changes voice*

Snapshot *return-visit-draft-4-pass-07-pacing*

- 5. Apply only the recorded decision.** Do not convert creative approval into permission to polish nearby lines:

The Writer
(to the agent)

APPLY only items 2 and 4 as approved in `projects/return-visit/revision-pass-log.md`. Map each approved PDF passage to the corresponding lines in `projects/return-visit/draft-4.fountain`; stop if that mapping is uncertain. Edit only those mapped lines. Show the diff, then check affected scenes against `projects/return-visit/story-bible.md`. Do not edit the log or story bible or create a snapshot.

You should get: a diff matching the pass log. Next: inspect every changed line before a snapshot.

- 6. Test the pass, then freeze it.** Read the changed scenes, check them against `projects/return-visit/story-bible.md`, and regenerate the review PDF. If a protected beat moved, wording escaped approval, or pagination broke, revert only this pass's changes from the pre-pass snapshot; preserve unrelated later work. When the pass holds, save `return-visit-draft-4-pass-07-pacing` and record that exact name in the log. The snapshot does not replace the final human read.

READY WHEN

Every changed line traces to the verbatim note, a numbered proposal, the writer's decision, the inspected diff, and an approved snapshot. The rationale remains in those records if the chat is lost.

CUT TO:

INDEPENDENT LENSES; ONE WRITER'S DECISION

Add a lens only if the problem it tests could force new pages, another review PDF, or another approval round after submission, and a person can inspect its report now. A lens is a production question, not a committee persona. More reports create more angles of attention, not more authority.

Define only the lenses the draft needs. Teaching clarity, pacing, character-continuity, and first-time-viewer accessibility ask different questions. A lens may report “nothing material.” Never imitate a named reviewer.

File the panel before running it. Use Guide 3's one-page anatomy:

The Writer
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. Preview the complete workflows/panel-read.md in chat. Include named inputs; one fresh-session ASK preview per approved lens; an exact report target under projects/return-visit/panel/; a separate APPLY step for each approved report; and a disagreement-map step after all reports are final. Define isolation: a lens may see only approved inputs and its own response. Treat exposure to another report, a desired answer, or prior panel synthesis as contamination; discard that output and stop. Also stop for missing sources, requested fixes, or an existing output target. Do not create or edit files.

You should get: one procedure that protects independent reads. *Next:* test it in a fresh session, then approve it before the first panel.

Keep every read independent. Give each lens the same approved inputs, but no other report or desired answer:

The Writer
(to the agent)

ASK only. In a fresh session, run the [approved-lens] read defined in workflows/panel-read.md on projects/return-visit/draft-4.pdf. Use only the workflow's approved inputs; do not expose another report, a desired answer, or the disagreement map. Preview one cited report for this lens. Do not recommend fixes or write files. Stop on missing inputs; label and discard any contaminated output.

You should get: one source-cited preview for the named lens, without cross-report contamination. *Next:* verify its inputs, citations, and uncertainties and confirm that its target does not exist. Then use the workflow's separate APPLY step to save the approved report. Repeat in a fresh session for each remaining lens.

THE DURABLE RECORD

```
projects/return-visit/
├─ panel/[lens]-[dated-draft].md one independent report per lens
├─ panel/disagreement-map.md agreements, conflicts, cited assumptions
├─ predictions/[dated-draft].md pre-review record, frozen
└─ pre-approval-checklist.md source-linked checklist + human sign-off
```

Synthesize disagreement, not a verdict. Wait until every report is final. Then map the pages and assumptions that deserve the writer's attention:

The Writer
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. After all reports are final, preview the complete contents of projects/return-visit/panel/disagreement-map.md in chat. Cite agreement and conflict across reports. For each conflict, quote any assumption stated in a report; if no supported assumption explains it, mark the cause unresolved. Do not rank lenses, decide changes, or create or edit files.

You should get: contested pages, shared concerns, supported assumptions, and unresolved causes. *Next:* approve the preview before a separate APPLY saves it, then investigate disagreement and decide whether a finding merits its own pass.

The map never votes, averages judgments, or merges language into a rewrite. The writer decides what matters.

Assemble the approval package. After any panel-driven revision, regenerate the PDF and rerun coverage:

The Writer
(to the agent)

ASK only. Run workflows/self-coverage.md on projects/return-visit/draft-4.pdf. Return the documented cited coverage in chat. Stop on any missing or unreadable input, and stop if projects/return-visit/coverage/2026-07-10-draft-4.md or projects/return-visit/predictions/2026-07-10-draft-4.md already exists. Do not create or edit files or change the draft.

You should get: cited final-draft coverage in chat and no file changes. *Next:* PROPOSE, approve, APPLY, and verify the coverage and prediction files separately; then complete the checklist:

- coverage, prediction, and panel records match the outgoing PDF;
- accepted passes have decisions, diffs, and snapshots; and
- a person has approved the outgoing draft.

The Writer
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. Preview the complete contents of projects/return-visit/pre-approval-checklist.md in chat for projects/return-visit/draft-4.pdf. Cite the exact paths for coverage, frozen prediction, panel reports, disagreement map, pass logs, diffs, snapshots, and canonical PDF. Mark anything missing. Do not create or edit files, and do not change or send the draft.

You should get: a source-linked checklist with missing items visible. *Next:* a person resolves the gaps and approves the outgoing draft.

WHEN THE ROOM IS CONTAMINATED

If a lens saw another report or desired answer, or APPLY touched unapproved lines, stop. Discard contaminated reports and revert only unauthorized hunks. Verify inputs and isolation before rerunning.

Guardrail. Panel and self-coverage are preflights, not sign-off. The writer owns the voice and revisions; a person approves the outgoing draft; actual notes remain evidence.

FADE OUT.