Response of IP on third round of Telugu LGR (Proposal of 2008-06-25)

DATE: 2018-06-28

# Overview

# All issues raised in previous IP response appear to have been incorporated.

# Conclusion

# The documents approach readiness for public review, but there are significant content issues that still need review and updates to the documents as appropriate. These include a potential simplification that appears possible for the context rules (due to interaction among rules) and a suggested change in cross-script variants. The latter affects Kannada and possibly Sinhala LGR as well.

# Comments on main document (.docx)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
| 1 | The word “Arthānusvāra” on p.5, 6 lines up | Consider re-spelling as “Ardhānusvāra” |
| 2 | In section 5 on 3rd line of p. 10, a Section Reference source is not connected. | Please adjust the link. |
| 3 | The word “perceptive” on 4th last paragraph of p. 25 | Consider replacing with “perceptual”, “auditory” or “acoustic”. |
|  |  |  |
| 3 | Cross-script variants with Sinhala: |  |
|  |  |
|  | The set above shows the only consonant that is proposed as a variant with Sinhala. In the opinion of the IP the similarity between the Telugu (0C30) and Sinhalese (0DBB) code points appears sufficiently remote to no longer be considered a homoglyph.The same applies to the Kannada (0CB0) / Sinhala (0DBB) pair.With only a single consonant (plus two combining marks) the overlap between Sinhala and these two scripts appears rather limited.As was the case with similar relation between SEA scripts, the IP would recommend dropping Sinhala 0DBB from the variant sets for both Kannada and Telugu. If that is done, the only remaining characters are combining marks 0D82 and 0D83 which can no longer form a cross-script label. They could then also be removed.  | Please reconsider the case for 0DBB as a cross-script variant. It appears marginal to the IP. If GP agrees to remove, 0D82 and 0D83 would also no longer be necessary. (Same feedback applies to Kannada). |
| 4 | Cross script variants with Kannada.Some of the proposed variants are much closer than others. However, the IP’s position is that given the closely related nature of the Kannada and Telugu scripts, a slightly extended view of homoglyph may be appropriate. | No action. |
| Rules | Note on rulesThe rule (shown here in HTML presentation)appears to have an unnecessary right hand side.Looking at all the other rules, it seems, they already restrict the right-hand side of a Halant to only C.* V by rule cannot follow H
* Anusvara and Visarga must follow V, M, C (and therefore not H)
* H cannot follow H (by left hand side of its rules)

Therefore only C (which is a superset of Nasal-C) can follow an H, even without a right-hand side rule on H itself.This means, that in the context of all the other rules the following simplification is possible:H : follows only C, except not Nasal-C(A footnote may point out that H must always occur between consonants, but that, collectively, the other rules already enforce that). | Please review, and if correct, please implement the simplification. |
| p 26 | In reviewing this we note the following BNF on page 26:CH([HC]\*)B,which appears to allow both CHB and CHHCB, assuming that \* means the usual “0 or more”.Could the intent have been C([HC]\*)B ? | Please review and fix as needed. |

# Comments on LGR specification (.xml)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
| Rules | If the suggested simplification of the rules for H is adopted, change rules in XML document to match.The new rule would becomefollows-C-except-Nasal-Cor in the regex notation ([:C:]\[:Nasal-C:] , using a set difference between the character classes for C and Nasal-C. The rule would become a “when” instead of a “not-when” rule.This would replace the compound rule “does-not-follow-C-or-follows-Nasal-C-and-precedes-C” and both its subsidiary rules “does-not-follow-C” and “follows-Nasal-C-and-precedes-C”. | Review and fix. |
| Other edits | There are several other editorial items in the XML. Suggested edits are not listed here, but changes have been incorporated into the attached XML document.These include incorrect version comment identifying the file as Gurmukhi, incorrectly stating that the proposal is for a Generation Panel and other items of similar vein.Note: neither the proposed rule change nor the proposed change in variants has yet been attempted in the XML file. | Please review and use the attached XML document as base for further changes. |

# Comments on Test Labels

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
|  | The test labels have not yet been reviewed. This review is pending; any findings will be submitted separately |  |
|  |  |  |