METHOD EXTRACTION / WORKED REVIEW

Keep the insight. Leave the client behind.

A worked example of editorial sanitisation. The private-context passage below is entirely fictional.

BEFORE / UNSUITABLE AS A REUSABLE FIRM LESSON

At Harth, Mira Vale should keep the £650 arrival guide: orientation requests fell from 14/40 to 6/40. The Hawthorn Legacy Fund is privately considering withholding a £45,000 renewal if the entrance project slips, and the director wants to avoid discussing a host's performance complaint. Use our 10-point reduction and 10% unresolved-enquiry limits on the next client too.

AFTER / GENERIC METHOD CANDIDATE

Before treating visible service friction as a capacity problem, classify the requests and test the leading explanation against a counterexample. Prefer a reversible intervention where evidence is limited. Agree the local constraints, measures and continue/revise/stop rule before the test. Keep a record of sources and limits; do not transfer another client's thresholds, economics or personnel context.

SEPARATE OUTPUTS

> Keep the original client decision intact. Save the reviewed method extraction separately. Neither a renamed file nor an alias is a confidentiality boundary.

The standalone candidate is data/sanitised-method.json. The full knowledge-pack.json deliberately retains labelled client examples and the fictional before passage. Do not treat the complete pack as sanitised.

REVIEW RECORD / REUSE BOUNDARIES

What was removed. What is worth keeping.

Names alone are not enough: remove identifying combinations and private context that do not serve the method.

Material	Editorial action
Harth; Mira Vale	Remove client and person names. Identity is not needed to retain the reasoning pattern.
£650; 14/40; 6/40	Remove exact economics and counts from the generic method; retain them only in the labelled client example. Exact combinations may identify an engagement and are not general evidence.
Hawthorn Legacy Fund; £45,000 renewal; performance complaint	Remove the entire donor and personnel context. Do not replace names with initials or copy it into comments. Neither fact is necessary to explain the method; aliases would preserve the sensitive context.
10-point; 10%	Replace copied thresholds with an instruction to agree assignment-specific criteria. A rule suitable for one test is not a firm-wide benchmark.
Reasoning sequence and caveats	Retain classification, counterexample, reversible test and evidence limits. These describe how to reason, without importing a client's facts.

REVIEWER CHECKS

01 Inspect title, body, tables, filenames, comments and metadata; not just visible names.

02 Look for rare combinations, exact numbers, dates, quotations and attachments that could identify the client.

03 Confirm the firm is permitted to reuse the underlying method; sanitisation alone does not grant rights.

04 Keep the original decision separate and unchanged. Store only the reviewed generic extraction as the reusable candidate.

Authored separation only. No automatic isolation, live Knowledge retrieval, skill execution, version rollout or native saved record is demonstrated.