Response of IP to Gurmukhi LGR of 25th May 2018

DATE: 2018-05-30

Overview

This document provides IP response to the Gurmukhi proposal dated 2018-05-25.

## General comments and comments on DOCX file

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item  | Issue | IP Comment |
| Previous responses: | The IP has reviewed document and XML file dated 2018-05-25 as well as the, the test label file and the responses by the GP to the previous round of feedback. | IP thanks the GP for their ready responses. The new text sections are very clear and to the point. |
| Current situation | The IP feels that the Gurmukhi proposal has reached maturity.However, there are a few relatively significant editorial issues with the XML file that should be addressed before this proposal goes to the next stage.There are a few further editorial suggestions, mostly minor, on both the DOCX file and the XML file. | The IP would consider this ready to go to the next stage – once certain fixes have been made.The IP recommends not submitting this to public comment until the Devanagari LGR is ready as well.Details as below. |
| Detailed editing | Copy of .DOCX is attached | With “Track Changes” suggestions.For some suggestions there’s an additional comment in the DOCX file alerting the GP that the suggested change should be carefully reviewed. |

## Comments on the XML file

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | Issue | IP Comment |
| **XML: classes** | The LGR contains 2 unused classes (“A” and “B”). An unused class is one that is not referred to in any rule. The IP will eventually remove unused ***named*** classes from the published LGR during integration and leaving them in the proposal would set up for a needless, if minor inconsistency. Note on Tags: there is no need to change the name for any tags, nor to remove "unused" ones. Tag values serve to document the function of a code point, whether they are used in any rule/class or not. | Suggest to remove any unused **named** classes from the XML file, if any.  |
| XML: Comments on <class> element: | There are no comments on the class elements. The IP would like to see these classes better documented in all LGRs. | Please review the proposed comments in the accompanying XML |
| XML:<description> | The IP made a number of suggestions for editorial changes to the <description> element. Most of these were related to increasing the consistency with the other LGRs (both NeoB and other scripts). In particular:1. Removed mention of Unicode General category
2. ”References” section in <description> needs MSR-2 reference updated to MSR-3

These issues have been updated to reflect the “typos fixed” version of the Gurmukhi LGR’s XML file. All issues here are still present after these fixes. | Please review and consider these suggestions. |
| **XML:<references>** | Reference 0 needs to be changed to match the document. (The issue was that the link does not go to a fixed Unicode 10.0.0 location, but is “Evergreen” and will soon point to the Unicode 11.0.0 version and so on.  | Replace version number by “accessed on <date>” |
| **Misc** | There’s some stray commented out test in the <rules> element right above <!—Whole label….-->There is a random “82 lines listed” at the bottom of the file. | Please delete |
| **Rule name** | One of the rules used “succeeds” where “precedes” is needed.Change name in both rule definition and rule invocation for 0A71.(The character the rule applies to comes before the class in question, therefore “precedes”.) | Please correct in the XML file |
| **XML: <action>** | Please add the default comment to the first action – this makes the merge script work properly:comment=”” |  |
| **Detailed editing for the XML file** | The IP included an edited copy of the XML file with **all of these** suggested changes for easy reference.Unfortunately, the XML format does not allow for change tracking, therefore we are including a Word document that shows a comparison of the differences when rendered as HTML. | Please compare the GP’s XML file to the version submitted for feedback and note suggested changes, review and/or use as basis for further edits. |

## Test files

Generally, the dispositions in the test file matches the valid/invalid/variant status. However, many invalid labels are invalidated because of a different rule than the one indicated in the test file. This may be a result of the “first invalid context” principle applied by the tool used for this verification.

A few labels were marked as repeated and therefore not validated.

The test protocols for cross-script variants aren’t as ready as for disposition testing, results aren’t as conclusive yet.