

Comment from Public Member Jack M. Beermann on *Online Processes in Agency Adjudication*  
May 3, 2023

I did some stylistic work on the preamble, which is what we haven't seen before.

Line 2: I don't see any need for the word "critical". Some might not be critical but are still subject to this recommendation.

Line 10: I suggest adding "documents" to the list. Same in the "allow users" sentence that follows "submit and view documents and case records"

Line 14: I would delete "can"--I think it does those things if properly employed. I would also change "for the public" to "to the public" since it refers mainly to accessible.

Line 19: Suggest changing "in" to "of"

Line 20: I would add "non-English speakers"--otherwise it sounds like the language problem is about people with disabilities.

Line 22: This sentence ["Many agencies have already begun implementing these processes"] seems redundant--we already said this at the beginning of the prior paragraph. Maybe delete this sentence and preface the next with "Examples of online adjudication processes include" and then then before the word "have" add "which"

Line 30: I would end the sentence here [after "them,"] and then start the next sentence with "Further, what works best." Otherwise it's really two different thoughts.

Line 32: Might consider changing "provide" to "suggest" just as a stylistic matter. Seems less officious.

Line 32: I would delete "positive", seems not to add anything to the sentence.

Line 33: I would move "can take" to after "agencies" in this sentence.