

# Publication: DITAweb: Review B (00811801-DC\_1)

## Topic: map (DA00508916)

### Paragraph-level comments

A DITA map is the mechanism for aggregating topic references and defining a context for those references. It contains references to topics, maps, and other resources; these references are organized into hierarchies, groups, and tables.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A DITA map is the mechanism for aggregating <b>references to topics and maps</b> and for defining a context for those references. It contains references to topics, maps, and other resources; these references are organized into hierarchies, groups, and tables.	sdoherly	updated	change	18/11/2021 14:42:07	
Hey, Stan. If we are defining a map -- and that is part of what we do in a natural language shortdesc, we don't want to include the word "map" as part of the definition. Also, this shortdesc is shared with LwDITA, which does not include mapref.	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 01:04:44	

A DITA map is the mechanism for aggregating topic references and defining a context for those references. It contains references to topics, maps, and other resources; these references are organized into hierarchies, groups, and tables.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Maps are also where keys are defined. Since keys are an important part of using DITA, should it be mentioned in here? Or is it covered by "other resources"? (Or not part of lwDITA?)	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:19:22	
And maps provide the context for key resolution. We've used the phrase "provides a context for those references" to indicate that. Was that too abstract for you?	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:23:03	
----- Discussed with Robert on our spec editors' call today. We cannot think of a better way to describe what a map is succinctly. And the spec is not intended to be a primer about DITA.					

A DITA map is the mechanism for aggregating topic references and defining a context for those references. It contains references to topics, maps, and other resources; these references are organized into hierarchies, groups, and tables.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A DITA map is the mechanism for aggregating topic references and defining a context for those references. It contains references to topics, maps, and other resources. These references are organized into hierarchies, groups, and tables.	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 14:13:13	
Done	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 23:55:33	

A map describes the relationships among a set of DITA topics. The following are types of relationships that can be described in a map:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
You mention that references are organized into tables in the shortdesc, but there isn't a description of relationship tables here. (Or at least not one that is obvious to me). Should there be something? Does Family relate to a relationship table and I just haven't thought about it?	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:26:02	
Hmmm, I don't know if we need to mention relationship tables or not. I suppose we could add a paragraph after the definition list, for example:  "In addition, a DITA map can contain relationship tables. Relationship tables can define relationships between resources that are not directly related based on their location in the navigation structure."  Robert, your thoughts?  -----	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:40:41	
Based on today's spec editors' call: Added that paragraph.					

Hierarchical

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Should we specify that this is the default behavior?	shudson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:27:32	

Hmm ... To me default suggests that it could be modified -  
 - and it cannot. The current language simply says that  
 "Nested topics **create** a hierarchical relationship," whereas  
 the language for "ordered" and "labeled" uses the phrase  
 "can be labeled."

keberlein updated comment 22/11/2021  
 17:44:06

Robert, your thoughts?

I think this is just an example of what type of hierarchy  
 can be created, it doesn't even state how you would  
 make the relationship, so we can't really call it a  
 "Default". (You can sort of say it's a default for  
 parent/child constructs, but we're not being that explicit,  
 and like Kris said that's just sort of something that "is"  
 by the fact of the markup.)

randerson updated comment 22/11/2021  
 21:02:08

The <title> element can be used to provide a title for the map. In some scenarios the title is purely informational; it is present only as an aid to the author. In other scenarios, the title might be useful or even required. In a map referenced by another map, the title might be discarded as topics from the submap are aggregated into a larger publication.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The element can be used to provide a title for the map. In some scenarios the title is purely informational ; <del>it</del> <b>and</b> is present only as an aid to the author. In other scenarios, the title might be useful or even required. In a map referenced by another map, the title might be discarded as topics from the submap are aggregated into a larger publication.	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 14:17:11	
Done	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:36:14	

When rendering a map, processors might make use of the relationships defined in the map to create a table of contents (TOC), aggregate topics into a PDF document, or create links between topics in the output.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Since maps also contain keys, do we want to reference that as part of rendering expectations? Even if it's just a link to the major section on key processing?	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:28:30	
Hmmm ... Does this topic need a "Processing expectations" section that contains a link to the current	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:47:35	

chapter (which currently is just a "to-be-written" dump of draft comments)?

Excellent point, Zoe. Robert, I've added such a section. It's parallel to what we did in the keyext topic.

The following code sample contains six <topicref> elements. The <topicref> elements are nested and have a hierarchical relationship. The file bats.dita is the parent topic, and the other topics are its children. The hierarchy could be used to generate a PDF, a navigation pane in an information center, a summary of the topics, or related links between the parent topic and its children.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The following code sample contains six elements. The elements are nested and have a hierarchical relationship. The file bats.dita is the parent topic ; and the other topics are its children. The hierarchy could be used to generate a PDF, a navigation pane in an information center, a summary of the topics, or related links between the parent topic and its children.	sdoherly	updated	change	18/11/2021 14:43:25	
I'm going to leave the wording as-is, for two reasons:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If I just list x elements, then we need to make it seven (because of title), and here we want the focus to be on the topicref elements.</li><li>• The IBM styleguide calls for using a comma to separate the two parts of the sentence.</li></ul>	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 20:33:36	

The following code sample contains six <topicref> elements. The <topicref> elements are nested and have a hierarchical relationship. The file bats.dita is the parent topic, and the other topics are its children. The hierarchy could be used to generate a PDF, a navigation pane in an information center, a summary of the topics, or related links between the parent topic and its children.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
FWIW -- wouldn't describing the hierarchy in terms of being a map "branch" be useful. Are we avoiding the term "branch"?	sdoherly	updated	comment	18/11/2021 14:44:26	
I think we want to be careful of using the term "branch," since we have "branch filtering." I don't see that using the term "branch" here gets us any advantage ...	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 20:35:02	

The following code sample contains six <topicref> elements. The <topicref> elements are nested and have a hierarchical relationship. The file bats.dita is the parent topic, and the other topics are its children. The hierarchy

could be used to generate a PDF, a navigation pane in an information center, a summary of the topics, or related links between the parent topic and its children.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I think "information center" is an old, IBM-centric term. HTML Frameset? Web help? HTML Knowledge base?					
Do we want to have an example of each of the three relationship types? For ordered, a map with a parent topic of GettingStartedWithWidget, and then child topics InstallingWidget, ConfigureWidget, IntegrateWithSprocket, CreateFirstWidget ?	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:36:09	
Unfortunately I don't have any idea about the family relationship.					
I have replaced "information center" with "web-based information system."					
I don't think we need to have examples that illustrate the effects of setting the linking attribute, but I can see why you raised the point; we discuss the types of links created in a map in the "Usage information" section. Robert, do you think we should add an example that shows the linking attribute?	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:29:12	
Thanks for providing concrete suggestions for adding an example of a map with linking="sequence"					
---					
Discussed with Robert at our spec editors' call today. As a result, I've changed the example to use the scenario that you suggested (rather than bats).					

## Topic: reltable (DA00509444)

### Paragraph-level comments

## Usage information

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I wonder whether we should use a non-CTR example here in "Usage information". The following are possibilities:	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 17:14:00	

- Links from topics to external resources, for example, troubleshooting tips in a service knowledgebase
- Source and target linking

Based on spec editors' call today: Add this as work item on our running list. But we do have higher-priority items to handle. keberlein updated comment 22/11/2021 22:36:00

Each column in a relationship table typically represents a specific role in a set of relationships. For example, a frequently-used type of relationship table uses the first column to contain references to task topics, while the second and third columns reference concept and reference topics. The relationship table rows define relationships between the resources referenced in different cells of the same row; in this example, each row establishes relationships between task topics and the concept and reference topics that support the tasks. When used in this manner, relationship tables can make it easy to determine where related information is missing or undefined.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
<p>Each column in a relationship table typically represents a specific role in a set of relationships. For example, a frequently-used type of relationship table <del>uses</del> <del>defines</del> <del>contains</del> <del>contains</del> <del>references to topics such that:</del> <del>uses</del> the first column <del>contains</del> <del>to contain references to</del> task topics, <del>while</del> the second <del>column</del> <del>contains</del> <del>concepts</del>, and <del>the</del> third column <del>contains</del> <del>s</del> <del>reference</del> <del>concept</del> <del>and</del> reference topics. The relationship table rows define relationships between the resources referenced in different cells of the same row; in this example, each row establishes relationships between task topics and the concept and reference topics that support the tasks. When used in this manner, relationship tables can make it easy to determine where related information is missing or undefined.</p>	shudson	updated	change	22/11/2021 16:48:01	
I tried to reword for clarity.	shudson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:50:41	
Changed to read as following:	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 17:10:44	
<p>"Each column in a relationship table typically represents a specific role in a set of relationships, and each row defines relationships between the resources that are referenced in the different cells of that row.</p>					
<p>A frequently-used type of relationship table uses the following structure:</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first column contains references to task topics.</li> <li>• The second column contains reference to concept topics.</li> </ul>					

- The third column contains references to reference topics.

Such a relationship table establishes relationships between task topics and the concept and reference topics that support the tasks. It help authors and architects determine where related information is missing or undefined.

In this example, the related links would be as follows:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This organization as a definition list bothers me; it's simply a list of file names, it feels like there should be more explanatory text, even something like "links to"	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:10:12	
I think this entire example needs reworking. Added a draft comment to the source, also added to our list of "to-dos".	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 22:37:30	

## Topic: Mapgroup domain elements (DA00513549)

Paragraph-level comments

### Mapgroup domain elements

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
In running text I see "mapgroup-domain elements" (with hyphen).	sdoherty	new	comment	18/11/2021 14:52:37	
I know that we refer to "mapgroup-domain module," but we do not hyphenate "mapgroup domain elements." Is that inconsistent and something that we should fix? Maybe ...					
IBM style guidelines call for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid long compund phrases and noun strings; use hyphens when appropriate.</li> <li>• Use hyphens to avoid ambiguity, but do not use them unnecessarily.</li> </ul>	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:58:15	

## Topic: mapresources (DC00811046)

## Paragraph-level comments

Map resources are objects with a `@processing-role` set to `resource-only`, for example, key definitions and subject scheme maps. Such resources do not contribute to the navigation structure, although they might be essential for correct authoring and processing.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Your suggestion is definitely an improvement over the original.	kschengli-roberts	updated	comment	21/11/2021 23:22:48	
I agree.	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 03:22:04	
Awesome. I'll make the change in the DITA topic. Thanks for your review.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 11:59:51	
I agree as well	esirois	updated	comment	22/11/2021 22:03:21	

## Topic: Basic map elements (DA00509164)

### Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I get why you repositioned "also" twice from the previous version (The <code>&lt;topicmeta&gt;</code> element is also available...), namely to indicate that <code>&lt;topicmeta&gt;</code> can be used not only in the context of a map, but in other ones as well.					
I'd say that I have a solid understanding of English, but I think that putting it this way, is... subtle and not so obvious for non-native speakers. Would it appear clumsy to native speakers, if I'd suggest the second sentence to start with: "Of them, the <code>&lt;topicmeta&gt;</code> element is available to specify metadata not only for the map, but also for individual topics..." ?	fwegmann	updated	comment	22/11/2021 20:31:49	
Ah, no. That was not our attention:	keberlein	updated	comment	23/11/2021 00:02:05	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We mentioned <code>topicmeta</code> separately, because it is NOT used for "referencing and organizing topics," just specifying metadata.</li><li>• I learned from IBM editors that the phrasing "also is available" is better than "is also available" -- and</li></ul>					



perhaps ironically, they stressed that this was for translation and ease of reading by ESL speakers.

- The topicmeta element is NOT available in topics; in topics, prolog is the equivalent element.

I've changed the shortdesc (provisionally) to read: "DITA maps are built from a few core elements that are used for referencing and organizing topics. In addition, the topicmeta element can be used to specify metadata for the map, individual topics, or groups of topics."

Does that work for you?

## Paragraph-level comments

DITA maps are built from a few core elements that are used for referencing and organizing topics. The <topicmeta> element also is available to specify metadata for the map, for individual topics, or for groups of topics. Many elements inside <topicmeta> also are available inside the topic prolog.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
DITA maps are built from a few core elements that are used for referencing and organizing topics. The element also is available to specify metadata for the map, for individual topics, or for groups of topics. Many elements inside <del>also</del> are <b>also</b> available inside the topic prolog.	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:34:59	
Closing this comment; see my response to Frank Wegmann's comment on the shortdesc.	keberlein	updated	comment	23/11/2021 00:08:41	

## Topic: keydef (DA00508764)

### Paragraph-level comments

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , link-relationship attributes , common map attributes , @keyref , and the attributes defined below.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
the phrase ", and the attributes defined below" appear in this topic and in the mapresources topic. I suspect it may also be in others, though I haven't noticed it in any others in this review group. But the phrase doesn't seem to be followed by attribute definitions; it's followed by attribute information specific to the element. I think in all these cases, the phrasing should be ", and the attributes below with the characteristics described."	nharrison	updated	comment	20/11/2021 22:08:05	

(or something of that nature)

Robert, can you take a look at this potential issue in the keydef and mapresources topics? Thanks.

-----

Based on spec editors' call today:

1. Yes, we need to remove the "and the attributes defined below".
2. We also need to change the introduction to the attribute from "From this element:" to a complete sentence.

keberlein updated comment 21/11/2021  
09:36:17

However, we are not immediately making such a change in this topic; we need to do it systematically across ALL element-reference topics.

## Topic: keytext (DC00811052)

### Paragraph-level comments

Key text is variable or link text that is used when resolving key references. It also specifies alternate text for images that are referenced by keys.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
In other sections, the reference topic does provide some insight into how the current element differs in function from an element very similar in function. For this enew element, it would be useful to add somethig along the lines of "Unlike DITA 1.3 key definitions, DITA 2.0 keytext can contain multiple, conditionalized values, complex formatting of the value, and variations that support both <ph> and <xref> resolution.	sdoherty	updated	comment	18/11/2021 14:38:55	
Hmmm ... That would not be appropriate for a shortdesc, nor do we want to make a comparison to DITA 1.3. But perhaps we should add a "Usage information" section and cover it there. FYI, the inclusion of ph in the content model is the only change from how variable text was handled in DITA 1.3; the major change is clear definition of how processors should handle precedence ...	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:49:01	
-----					
Discussed on spec editors' call today: We don't want to make this exhaustive, nor do we want to include a					

discussion of the content model. That's defined in the grammar files.

The section contains examples of how the <keytext> element can be used.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This section contains examples of how the element can be used.	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:55:27	
Done	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:39:06	

### Simple example

The following code sample shows how variable text can be defined using the <keytext> element:

```
<keydef keys="company-name">  
  <topicmeta>  
    <keytext translate="no">Acme Widget Company</keytext>  
  </topicmeta>  
</keydef>
```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Hoping the spec is using DITA 2.0, so you can actually mark these as &lt;example> in the source?	shudson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:25:49	
Nope. We use a single example element. When we have multiple example elements, we use fig elements with titles for the separate examples. We set this markup up long ago.					
Changing to use an example elements for each "example" would require the following:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Changes to many element reference topics</li><li>• Changes to our stylesheets</li></ul>	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 17:18:50	
It's not a priority right now, given our schedule and shortage of (human) resources, I think. And it's probably more important to implement this markup change in the architectural topics ...					
The whole section is itself an example, using the &lt;example> element, which works in DITA 1.3 and 2.0.	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:24:48	

I think trying to change that to use a section with nested example elements would actually break our spec - we explicitly state that examples are non-normative, which covers the whole section titled "Examples". If we switched it to be a section, the connective text between code samples would be normative, while the code samples would not.

The image can be referenced by `<image keyref="company-logo"/>` . When rendered to mediums that support alternate text, the effective alternative text for the image is "Acme Widgets logo" as though a literal `<alt>` element had been a child of the `<image>`

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
missing period after <code>&amp;lt;image&gt;</code> .	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:11:22	
Good eye! I've made the correction.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:57:24	

```
<keydef keys="company-name">
  <topicmeta>
    <keytext translate="no">
      <ph product="cat">Acme Widgets for Cats</ph>
      <ph product="dog">Acme Widgets for Dogs</ph>
      <ph product="pig">Acme Widgets for Pigs</ph>
    </keytext>
  </topicmeta>
</keydef>
```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I cannot select the <code>&amp;lt;keydef&gt;</code> and get it inserted as a change... In any case, the <code>@keys</code> value should be " <b>product-name</b> ", not " <b>company-name</b> ".					
Does this example really make sense? Surely we'd define a key for each product at the map level? This example would only make sense if one document is produced that describes multiple products. Maybe we should say this, and refer them to the best-practice of keys usage for variables in the arch spec? I am moving my clients away from the usage shown in this example in favor of keys defined at the map level so that the topics don't have to deal with any conditional text. It's a far superior reuse model for writers to grasp and maintain.	gjoseph	updated	comment	22/11/2021 14:06:14	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changed to <code>keydef keys="product-name"</code> . You are never going to be able to select a part of a codeblock element, only the element itself.</li> </ul>	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:47:42	

- Changed the intro sentence to read: "DITA implementations might need to conditionally process product names, especially for topics that are reused in multiple publications."

We **are** targeting the example use case in which topics are shared among different products, and then the key definition is conditionally processed to use so that the correct variable text is used. Obviously, if that's not a use case for a company, then one would hope that they'd avoid unnecessary complications in their architecture.

-----

And we are removing this example, because we think this topic contains too many examples.

To set distinct text values for both the company name and the link text that is associated with the company Web site, best practices call for using two different key definitions.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Hmmm . . . this is really a recommendation. There can't be a "best practice" for a feature that is not yet deployed.	sdoherthy	updated	comment	18/11/2021 14:40:44	
Not sure. I think this might fall in the bucket of standard best practices for key definitions.					
-----					
Edited comment: I take my earlier comment back. This example does cover new processing logic. See my response to Scott's similar comment.	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:59:30	
+1	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:27:55	

To set distinct text values for both the company name and the link text that is associated with the company Web site, best practices call for using two different key definitions.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Not sure we want to claim anything as a "best practice" in the spec. Also, it would be better to show the example of how to use/set the distinct values.	shudson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:24:42	
Changed to read:	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 19:19:20	

"Once processed, the effective text content of both `&lt;ph keyref="company-name"/>` and `&lt;xref keyref="company-name"/>` is Acme Tools. **This is because of the rules for how processors resolve key references to generate text or link text.**

To set distinct text values for both the company name and the link text that is associated with the company Web site, use **two different keys.**"

(Emphasis added here, not in DITA source.)

I don't think we need a more elaborate example. Here, someone would just need to have keys such as "company-name" and "company-linktext". The purpose of the example was to highlight the processing logic for variable text resolution

## Topic: line-through (DA00509380)

### Paragraph-level comments

A strikethrough is a typographical presentation of words with a horizontal line through their center. It can indicate that words are a mistake and not intended for inclusion, or it can be used deliberately to imply a change of thought.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
For a non-English speaker, this could be confusing; the name of the element is line-through, but the description doesn't mention that, only strikethrough. Perhaps:					
Line-through refers to a strikethrough, which is a typographical presentations...	nharrison	updated	comment	20/11/2021 21:47:26	
Or you could use the phrasing from <code>&amp;lt;u&gt;</code> :					
A line-through, also called a strikethrough, is a ...					
This one is tricky. The term "strikethrough" is the technically correct term; see <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strikethrough">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strikethrough</a> . "line-through" is the value for the CSS text-decoration property. So, strikethrough is not really also called line-through. And we are committed to using natural language in the short descriptions.	keberlein	updated	comment	21/11/2021 09:29:09	
I suppose we could maybe add the following. But should it go in the shortdesc? Or "Usage information"?					

"A strikethrough is represented by the line-through value for the CSS text-decoration property."

-----

Discussed on spec editors' call today: Added the sentence to the shortdesc.

## Topic: anchor (DA00509266)

### Paragraph-level comments

An anchor within a map is an integration point that another map can reference in order to insert its navigation into the navigation tree of the referenced map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
<p>I have read this sentence 10 times and still am not clear on how this works. Does the foreign map pull this map into that foreign maps's structure or vice-versa? I suggest we replace "its navigation" with "this map" or "the other map" and also change "of the referenced map" to either "this map" or "the other map".</p>	gjoseph	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:41:43	
<p>From reading further, it seems to me this is a "push" mechanism, to push or insert a map into another map. I wonder if we should use the term "push" or whatever term we use globally to denote a push type of function.</p>					
<p>I've recast the shortdesc (provisionally) as follows:</p> <p>"An anchor is an integration point in a DITA map. Another map can reference the anchor in order to insert a navigation structure into the map that contains the anchor."</p> <p>I've also changed the "Usage information" section to read as follows:</p> <p>"The anchor element typically is used to allow integration of run-time components. Another map can reference the anchor by using an anchorrelement or the @anchorref attribute on map . This enables the navigation structure of a map or map branch to be inserted at the location of the anchor."</p>					
<p>Robert, what do you think?</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Discussed at spec editors' call today; OK to go.</p>					

The <anchor> element typically is used to allow integration of run-time components. For build-time integration, you can use a <topicref> element to reference another map, or use the @conref or @conkeyref attribute on an element inside the map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
What would be an example of a "run-time component"?	sdoherly	updated	comment	18/11/2021 14:33:40	
An Eclipse plug-in is what immediately comes to mind. I'm pretty sure that's what the anchor/anchorref functionality was originally added for. I honestly don't know if many people still use Eclipse help or this sort of functionality.	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 20:39:11	
This was explicitly based on an Eclipse functionality (which I think was even called "anchor"). Last I heard, the behavior carried through into the follow-on Knowledge Center application used in IBM.	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:35:36	

## Example

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Example <b>s</b>	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:56:02	
Done	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:34:43	

In the following code sample, the DITA map references a DITA map using the @anchorref attribute:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
In the following code sample, the DITA map references a <b>nother</b> DITA map using the @anchorref attribute:	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:45:08	
Done	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:51:28	

```
<map anchorref="map1.ditamap#a1">
  <title>This map is can be rendered at the "a1" anchor
  in the MyComponent task map</title>
  <!-- ... -->
</map>
```



Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This map can be rendered at the "a1" anchor (there's an extra is)	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:06:55	
Rendered or inserted? Rendered is probably the correct processing term, but inserted is how my brain understands it better.					
Corrected! Yes, rendered is the corrected term.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:01:17	

```
<map anchorref="map1.ditamap#a1">
  <title>This map is can be rendered at the "a1" anchor
  in the MyComponent task map</title>
  <!-- ... -->
</map>
```

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This map is <del>can be</del> rendered at the "a1" anchor MyComponent task map	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:46:12	
Duplicate of Zoe's comments	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:32:32	

## Topic: topicmeta (DA00509455)

### Paragraph-level comments

Topic metadata is metadata that applies to a topic based on its context in a map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The <b>topicmeta</b> element defines <b>Topic metadata</b> is metadata that applies to a topic based <b>the given on its</b> context <b>of that topic</b> - in a map.	shudson	updated	change	22/11/2021 16:59:03	
No, wherever possible we use natural language in a short description. We only use the construct that you suggested when natural language would be especially tortuous or impossible, such as in the classification domain.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 17:22:02	

## Topic: anchorref (DA00509464)

### Paragraph-level comments

The <anchoref> element is specialized from <topicref>. It is defined in the mapgroup module.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The <anchorref> element is specialized from . It is defined in the mapgroup module.	sdoherly	updated	change	18/11/2021 14:53:57	
Corrected the spelling of the element name. Thanks for catching that!	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:50:49	

## Topic: relcolspec (DA00509259)

### Paragraph-level comments

When values are specified for attributes of <relcell> or <relrow> elements, those values override those defined for <relcolspec> attributes. Values specified for attributes of <relcolspec> elements override those defined for the <reltable> element.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
relrow don't allow the same set of attributes as relcolspec or relcell. relrow can only override universal attributes. Is that important?	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 02:20:15	
Robert, perhaps we need to make the wording here crisper? Maybe specify which attributes come into play here? I know I asked you before this review about just what we were trying to say in this section ...	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:10:48	
Zoe, I think here we are primarily referring to type and format attributes ...					
I don't think we need to be explicit here about which attributes go on which element (that always gets messy and becomes a maintenance problem).					
I think it's fine that relrow doesn't allow a bunch of these; an application can look for them or not, but the grammar will never let you specify something like "scope" on the relrow, so it will never be found and implementations will not differ.	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:42:09	

## Topic: mapref (DA00509018)

### Paragraph-level comments

## Examples

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Should this be Example? even though there are multiple figures, it's only one example of using mapref. That's how it worked for anchorref.	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 03:19:57	
No, we are changing anchoref so that the section there is "Examples".	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:15:58	

## Topic: navref (DA00509582)

### Paragraph-level comments

The <navref> element is intended as a reference to a navigation resource that can be resolved at rendering time. It enables DITA maps to be published into a help system where the referenced navigation is published independently (or might not be available at all). If available, the referenced navigation can then be resolved at rendering time within a help system.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This description is specific to 'help system' but I've only ever used it with content posted to a website. "to be published into a help system or set of html pages" to be more generic?	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:45:44	
Hmmm ... Perhaps "web-based information system" would be appropriate?					
Robert, your thoughts? Perhaps we ought to do a global search through the spec and see where we refer to information centers, help systems, web pages, etc.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:13:34	
-----					
Made the change					
I think that "web-based information system" is fine at this point, yes	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:43:22	

**Draft comment:** Kristen J Eberlein 10 November 2021

Does the following information really belong here? It seems to be very basic map info.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I think I see that the direct inclusion information is to compare it against how you use navref, but seeing how to do something else before seeing how to do navref first is more confusing to me. I think a "for direct inclusion, go see topicref (or mapref)" would be less confusing.	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:43:44	
And I really don't know if we need the information here at all! Robert and I did not talk about this draft before the review, so we'll try to talk about it in our spec call today.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:15:57	
Agreed, I think we should remove it -- it is causing more confusion than it's helping	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:43:57	
Removed the draft comment and the content	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 23:31:21	

In order to include another map directly without depending on the output format or help system, use a `<topicref>` element with the `@format` attribute set to `ditamap`. The effect is similar to using a `@conref` attribute. For example, the following markup represents a literal inclusion of the map `other.ditamap`:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Not sure this belongs here? What does it have to do with <code>&lt;navref&gt;</code> ? If you provide the example of <code>topicref</code> , shouldn't you also include an example of <code>&lt;mapref&gt;</code> ?	shudson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:32:10	
Yes -- Note the draft comment in the topic. I don't think it belongs here either. Robert and I will discuss this on our spec call today. -----	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 17:25:44	
Removed the content and the draft comment					
+1 to removing it	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:44:20	

**Topic: relcell (DA00509157)**

## Paragraph-level comments

A relationship table cell does not imply a relationship between topics or resources that are referenced in the same cell, unless the @collection-type attribute cell indicates that they are related.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
@collection-type attribute of the cell? for the cell? I think there's an article missing.	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:52:47	
Good catch! I've changed it to "... unless the collection-type attribute <b>set on the</b> cell indicates that they are related."	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:08:11	

A relationship table cell does not imply a relationship between topics or resources that are referenced in the same cell, unless the @collection-type attribute cell indicates that they are related.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
A relationship table cell does not imply a relationship between topics or resources that are referenced in the same cell, unless the @collection-type attribute <b>on the</b> cell indicates that they are related.	shudson	updated	change	22/11/2021 16:35:42	
Duplicate of Zoe's above comment.	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:46:37	

## Topic: Emphasis domain elements (DC00810965)

### Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Silly thought - these seem related to the HTML em/strong elements. Do we want to mention that alignment, like we did for the media domain elements?	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 03:01:20	
Good point ... I think not, because unlike object, we do not base the design completely on the HTML5 element. Robert, your thoughts?  -----	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:11:07	

Discussed at spec editors' call today: We also don't want to add such info to all the highlighting domain topics.

I kind of think not, just because if we add that here we should probably also add it to the highlighting domain (which is in there entirely because of HTML). And then we get into the same arguments HTML has about why we're doing both...

randerson updated comment 22/11/2021 21:46:05

## Paragraph-level comments

# Topic: topicgroup (DA00508669)

## Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I'm reviewing this too late at night, but is there an equivalence for this element? <code>&lt;topicref&gt;</code> with...something? (same for <code>topichead</code> )	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 03:25:41	
I also really like the example, it gives a good use case.					
I don't think that <code>topicgroup</code> and <code>topichead</code> are convenience elements; I cannot think of how to accomplish what they do with a <code>topicref</code> element with a set of standard attributes defaulted. Robert, am I correct?	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:19:03	
They are convenience elements -- in the DITA 2.0 example above, it would mean exactly the same thing if you switched from <code>topicgroup</code> to <code>element</code> . That's really only the case because it uses the new <code>titlehint</code> element, in DITA 1.3 you would not be able to put that hint in there because having a <code>navtitle</code> would make it exactly equivalent to a <code>topichead</code> .	randerson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 21:48:55	
Added the following content: "The element is a convenience element. It is equivalent to <code>aelement</code> without a navigation title or <code>@href</code> , <code>@keys</code> , <code>@keyref</code> attributes."	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 23:24:14	

## Paragraph-level comments