

Get started · Learning paths

Path: reviewer or scholar

🕒 2 min read · Updated 27 September 2026

For a Granthi, a scholar or a maintainer who reviews changes and never writes code: what the project promises, where the text is proven, what a review is asked to check, and how to say no.

<https://docs.gurbanisoul.com/learning-paths/reviewer-scholar/>

You review; you do not write code. Half a day, in this order. Nothing here needs a terminal.

Interactive on the web: a checklist that remembers what you have done.

- ☐ **What Sri Guru Granth Sahib Ji is** — the one rule, as the project states it. Everything you review is measured against it.
- ☐ **The structure of the Granth** — check the numbers against what you know; the poster's segments name every raag and Vaar.
- ☐ **Gurmukhi and Unicode** — the table of what the pipeline may and may not do. This is the heart of a fidelity review.
- ☐ **The editorial ledger** — the four rules and eleven applications, approved in the scholar review of 2026-09-24; and the canonical **scripture integrity** page.
- ☐ **The Answer Protocol** — the eight rules any answer from this knowledge base must follow.
- ☐ Try the **Ang explorer** on an Ang you know well, and the **verify playground** with a line from memory: the engine should refuse to guess.
- ☐ **Nitnem for engineers** — the non-SGGS layer, reviewed line by line against the SGPC Nitnem Gutka (attested REVIEWED: true on 2026-09-21), and what that attestation gates.
- ☐ **The reverence checklist** and **who to ask**.
- ☐ **Exercise 05 — fix a poster**, reading part only: find a statement on any poster you believe is wrong and open an issue with the **scripture-fidelity** template if it concerns the text, or a documentation issue otherwise.

How to say no: a review that finds a text concern never proposes an edit. It names the Ang, the line and the printed page, and the **support runbook** and the ledger take it from there. “Leave it as printed” is a complete and valued answer.