Hallo Odelphi123,

I have been playing around with your „Realize Chord“-tool a while.

That is a remarkable piece of work! I love it and will use it henceforth.

May I suggest some slight improvements?

1. I use the German version of Musescore. There the context menu of the chord symbol says “Akkordsymbole realisieren”. That is not wrong at all but somehow ambiguous. In German “realisieren” has two meanings: “making something real”, “let something become reality” (an idea or something similar) – and “notice”, “perceive” or just “realize”. The English “realize” can be translated into German as “erkennen”, “begreifen”, “verstehen” but as well as “ausführen”. What your tool does is not just “ausführen” which would be rather “execute” or “perform” (that’s already done by just clicking on the chord symbol). What it does is rather the first meaning, that is, it creates permanent chord notes in the staff. So may I suggest changing the entry in the context menu into “Akkordsymbol in Noten umwandeln” or “Akkordsymbol in Noten wandeln” which is slightly shorter regarding the available space in the context menu? My suggestion is of no importance at all, however. It just makes it a bit more transparent what happens when clicking on the entry. I just had this idea … out of my language-feeling, please forgive me. If you don’t like it, forget it quickly ☺
If you are prone to think the suggestion over, then there could be a second text that might be formulated in different way. For the duration you give an option that is translated into German as “Dauer Note/Pause” (I don’t know what English name this option has). At first I didn’t quite get, what this meant – all and absolutely my fault! The note with the symbol had been a whole note in my test example, for which reason the meaning of that option didn't reveal to me at once. After some “concentration” on what I was reading, however, I understood ☺. It’s all OK. “Duration” is of course “Dauer” in German. Regarding the time a note is sounding, I think, in German it is more common to call it “Notenlänge” which would be “length” in English. That’s colloquial speech, whereas “Dauer” sounds more academic. The German “Dauer” is not wrong at all, though. Again it is just my language-feeling. But me musing about why I had been irritated at first would instinctively translate it into German as “Notenlänge / Pausenlänge”. Make one word of it, not two. I would even omit the pause (“Pause”) because if there was no note, then it would be obvious that the pause is a placeholder for a note, and the length the "note" is related to, is that of the pause. Here again: If you don’t like it, forget it quickly☺

You are a piano man, aren’t you? I am just a guitarist nothing else, so my further comments may reveal not much competence in how chords should be noted for a keyboard. Please be patient if I am not aware of some reason that’s obvious for you.

1. I played with the various options in the popup dialogue. What I realized (! ☺) is that the resulting notes are always packed into one staff. I suppose this is in case the symbol belongs to a single staff. But it also happens when the symbol belongs to a combined staff as for the piano. For me, this looks a bit strange. Should not at least the lowest note be relocated to the left-hand staff? Maybe even the two (or three?) lowest notes – depending on the range (wide or close) and the number of notes in the chord?
2. All chords have a real low root note. Often it is more than an octave away from the next note further up. That looks as if it *IS* meant for piano/keyboard mainly. I know, a piano voice can be packed into a single staff only, too. Then it is exactly what it should look like. I don’t see a problem there as long as you use it in close range. In wide range, however, I wonder if a pianist could finger this chord then. The more I wonder in respect of 6-note-chords, where it may be even more difficult to span the range of more than one octave with one hand and still finger not only the outer notes but some more in between. And in wide range, I recognized, too, that notes like the seventh or ninth are always placed close to the root note. Can this be called “wide range”? I always had the idea that in wide range all notes are distributed in a way that at least second intervals are avoided and the notes are distributed rather “evenly” across the whole range … I believe, in wide range the 7th and 9th could as well be moved one octave down which would bring them more into convenient reach for the left hand and made it easier so to split the chord into two hands and finger them separately, wouldn’t it? It would also eliminate their close proximity to the root note or third, hence it would eliminate second intervals. But, as said before, here I am a complete beginner. You sure know what you’re doing. I just wondered ….
3. I came across a strange behaviour: If you have a pause or a single note or a chord with a symbol on top and that measure is followed by measures without chord symbols, and you click that symbol with the right mouse button only (!) (to get the context menu for to activate the “realize chord” tool), then all works well – you can stick to the default option “until next symbol” or choose individually the option “until end of measure”. The notes are created according to the chosen option. HOWEVER, if you now click a second time on that symbol with the right mouse button only, that is, if it had been already marked before the right mouse button click (e. g. you edited the symbol and left the edit mode by pressing ESC. Or, you clicked it first with the left mouse button just to mark it. Or, you withdraw an action on that symbol, which leaves it marked), then, clicking on that symbol anew with the right mouse button (to activate the tool), the default option is executed immediately just before opening the popup dialogue. With the default being the “until next symbol”-option, there a lot of following measures might be filled with that chord, all bound together – even if they previously have been empty! If you then, in the popup menu, choose the option “until end of measure”, it does what you expect. But, as the following measures had already been filled, they remain as they are – filled and bound to each other – only the slurs from the actual measure are removed. (I have illustrated this case at the end of my testing Musescore sheet). If the tool is executed on a symbol that has already been marked and that is the object last marked, the default option is executed in advance, which surely is not intended, neither by you, the creator, nor the user. My impression is that a variable or procedure called upon mouse action isn’t properly initialized … something like that …. It’s not a grave fault, but irritating and could become annoying if you have to clean up a bunch of measures afterward.
4. Regarding the interpretation mode: Your “Jazz” interpretation seems to simply add a “ninth” but not a “seventh” to every chord. That makes it an Xsus9 / Xadd9 but not an X9. I like to add a flat seven with the nine, too, or a flat seven alone, to gain some jazzy feeling – even to chords that do not function as dominants, even to the tonic. Sometimes … .
I suppose you say, a 7th (that is, a flattened 7th) should always be indicated explicitly, for it changes the character of the chord into something like a dominant? Well in Jazz it is not necessarily so, IMHO. And in traditional music, it is true for Major chords, not so much for Minor chords. Often Minor chords are part of a II-V-I progression and the flattened seventh for the Minor chord is characteristic, but it’s not a dominant. I understand, however, that leaving the 7th to the user's decision could be a defensive strategy and I would stick to your side for that. I also understand that adding more additional thirds (11th, 13th) automatically would be as questionable, for they might not always work with the given melody. Therefore I admit that they, too, have to be indicated explicitly in the symbol, what proves necessary the more if they are altered (which then includes an altered 5th). But what do you think about “major sevenths”? I have learned about an approach that understands a “major seventh” just as sort of a colour that can be added to every chord that is not meant as a dominant, in other words, that has no flattened seventh. It could, of course, not be done if the chord already contained a seventh ... Do you think this would bring some more jazz feeling? I am not sure about it myself, just want to discuss ideas. Perhaps the 9th + 7th and/or 11th and/or 13th or the major seventh should be added to the interpretation-option list as “jazzy (incl 9 & 7)” / “jazzy with 13 (incl 9 & 7)” / “jazzy with 11 (incl. 9 &7)” etc.? The 11th could be skipped, however, for it not so often is applied, at least unaltered.
5. The last observation: The checkbox “override with user preferences” could be completely removed. The options then would be available at once. As one default set of options has to be preset, anyway, that produces exactly the same as when the said checkbox is not marked. Marked or not makes no difference. Therefore it can be omitted. It spares you a mouse click. Regarding the chord layering, “automatically" does exactly the same as “close range” does. One of those could therefore be omitted, too. I would vote for "automatically" to be omitted. “close range” then would be the default option.
What about Inversions? Yes, you sometimes use inversions even now. But as far as I have seen there is only one form for each chord symbol of the same chord layer mode. For C, D, or E you use always the basic position, for F or G the 2nd inversion, for A and B the 1st inversion. I haven’t found a progression where C would automatically appear in 2nd inversion … That's what I am aiming for with my question about the inversions. I guess you did so because of “composition rules” that require avoiding jumps and prefer the shortest move of a note from one chord to the other. Still, it might be wishful, to start with C in 2nd inversion (or 1st) and then adapting the succeeding chords. Do you think this to be an idea - to offer such a choice in the chord layers option? E.g. as “1st inversion (4 notes)”/ “2nd inversion (4 notes)” / “3rd inversion (4 notes)”. 4 or 3 notes – see some lines below.
Besides that, at present, a 7th is always placed beneath the root note, the ninth always above the root note. The 7th I’d rather prefer above the 5th, the 9th even above the 7th (as their names suggest). Then they could even be included in inversions …
I guess, you have set this aside and kept it for further development … I would encourage you to implement this one day. I’d suggest, then to create inversions for three-note-chords or four-note-chords (four notes seem better, for you can include a 7th – in order to include a 9th I would remove the 5th and not add more notes). For the time being, I would disregard the bass completely. Only after having created inversions quite mechanically by mirroring the lowest note one octave up, I would add a fourth or fifth note representing the root note as the bass.
This is only rough, first thinking. I leave it to you and I’m curious about how your great tool will further evolve.

Best regards, Michael.

If you want to continue discussion you can reach me via paul@gimmelfam.de.