

Publication: Review N: Translation and localization (00816277-DC_1)

Topic: The Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm (DC00816267)

Paragraph-level comments

- Documents that contain text in both LTR and RLT languages, for example, a topic that list the names of a book in multiple languages

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Documents that contain text in both LTR and RLT languages, for example, a topic that list s the names of a book in multiple languages	gjoseph	updated	change	6/4/2022 11:05:40	
Done. Marked as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	8/4/2022 04:11:34	

- Documents that contain text in both LTR and RLT languages, for example, a topic that list the names of a book in multiple languages

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Would a better example be "a topic that contains a hazard statement in multiple languages"?	gjoseph	updated	comment	6/4/2022 11:06:28	
I was trying to keep the spec from being entirely techDoc focused. I'm going to change this "names of a movie." Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/4/2022 14:44:17	

The Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm specifies how text should be rendered for a given language. For more information about the Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm, see the following resources:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Add reference to the following: https://www.unicode.org/reports/tr9/ ----- Done. Marking comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	5/4/2022 14:57:31	

Topic: The dir attribute (DA00513597)

Paragraph-level comments

The @dir attribute identifies or overrides the text directionality. The following values are valid:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Do we want to explicitly state that we expect processors to handle direction based on @xml:lang? Only use this if you are combining languages that have different directions?					
I understood better after I read 1.2.1 The Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm, but part of me thinks it needs to be up higher. This might help with the draft-comment below as well? Maybe?	zlawson	updated comment		10/4/2022 01:06:52	
Zoe, we do state exactly that in "Recommended usage of the dir attribute." I don't really think we can improve the order of the topics here: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We want "The @dir attribute" to be the top-level topic, and we need that topic to state what the attribute is and what the possible values for it atr.2. It's followed by "The Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm," which provides a VERY HIGH-LEVEL overview, and then points folks to the relevant spec.3. "Recommended usage of the dir attribute" outlines (again, at a very high level) when the dir attribute might need to be specified.4. "Processing expectations about the Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm" states a critical normative statement.					
	keberlein	updated comment		11/4/2022 18:57:19	
Marking this comment CLOSED .					

Indicates left-to-right. This is the processing default.
Draft comment: robander 4 April 2022

External standards for the dir attribute refer to "ltr" as the default, and in DITA 1.3 we described this as the processing default. I question this a bit, if I have a Hebrew document that does not specify @dir, and generate HTML, I'm going to put dir="rtl" in the HTML - basically I've set up processing so that the default is based on the xml:lang (or default xml:lang).

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Agreed. It seems the rest of this section actually does say that as	dsteven	updated comment		5/4/2022	

long as the unicode bidirectional algorithm is supported, the xml:lang does determine the direction, right?

15:10:13

We discussed this in the TC call today (05 April 2022) and decided to remove the sentence "This is the processing default."

keberlein updated comment 5/4/2022 23:33:27

Done, and marking comment as **COMPLETED**.

Topic: Example: content reference and the xml:lang attribute (DC00816244)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The example contains markup errors. Since we're going to hopefully replace it with a more common use case, I am not going to comment on the current topic. If for some reason you end up keeping this example, I'll provide feedback at that time...	gjoseph	updated	comment	6/4/2022 11:01:04	
@Gershon, I'm not aware of markup errors other than the one that Dawn pointed out, which has been fixed. The problem with this example is that it MUST demonstrate how the processor needs to use the value of xml:lang from the referenced element. That leads to the contrived example ...	keberlein	new	comment	11/4/2022 14:48:15	

Paragraph-level comments

This scenario kind of exemplifies an edge case of an edge case ... I don't know how many examples of @xml:lang we need, but this one seems very contrived.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Agreed. Most uses of xml:lang within my clients is for multi-lingual documents. Perhaps an example for that?	dsteven	new	comment	5/4/2022 15:05:57	
There are two issues here: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need an example for this use case. Can we think of a scenario that would be more realistic than the one we describe here? 	keberlein	new	comment	5/4/2022 23:24:26	

- I don't know if we need additional examples for @xml:lang. If so, the obvious first choice would be a topic that contains multilingual content: legal notices or warnings or maybe a topic that listed the title of a best-selling book or movie and how it is translated.

Regarding whether we need additional examples of @xml:lang, we need to think about the following:

- Does anyone, especially developers of DITA implementations, run into issues here? The spec isn't a user guide ...
- The @xml:lang is part of the XML spec, as opposed to being a DITA-specific attribute, like @conref or @conkeyref. Because of this, do we want folks to look primarily to the XML spec for elaboration about the attribute?

Random thoughts for multi-lingual examples:

Quick start guide for consumer electronics or kitchen gear. I think can find some examples around the house of instructions for using a soda fountain, pasta machine, or FitBit. I know most have one or two pages per languages, but I have seen examples where there's an image and then the same step in 8 different languages. I can tell that the tools have different models, so the content is reused between models as appropriate (which would account for the conref)

zlawson new comment 10/4/2022 00:47:16

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
  <!DOCTYPE topic PUBLIC "-//OASIS//DTD DITA Topic//EN" "topic.dtd">
  <topic id="warnings">
    <title>Warnings</title>
    <body>
      <sectionxml:lang="fr">
        <title>French warnings</title>
        <p>These are our French warnings.</p>
        <note id="french1">Note in French!</note>
        <!-- ... -->
      </section>
      <section xml:lang="en">
        <title>English warnings</title>
        <p>These are our English warnings.</p>
        <note id="english1">Note in English!</note>
        <!-- ... -->
      </section>
    </body>
  </topic>
```

add space between section and xml:lang="fr" in first section element in the body. dstevens updated comment 5/4/2022 15:02:27

Done. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED**. keberlein updated comment 5/4/2022 23:10:20

Note that the value of the @xml:lang attribute of the referenced note is set by the containing <section> element that sets the @xml:lang attribute to fr. When the topic that contained the conrefed note is processed, the <note> element with the @id attribute set to mynote has an effective value for the @xml:lang attribute of fr.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
If you keep this example, can you explicitly state that <note> with the @id="mynote" is in the first codeblock? It took me a bit to figure out I needed to go back to the first set of code.	zlawson	updated	comment	10/4/2022 00:40:47	
Also, do we want to say "code block" when we're describing the code example? I know the element is codeblock, but I think we want to say "the following code sample".					
I think code block is fine. We use that term routinely in architectural example topics, where we usually have multiple code samples.					
I don't see a way clear to adding more clarifying information about which code block contains referencing element; we already state that explicitly.	keberlein	updated	comment	11/4/2022 15:03:06	
Marking this comment as CLOSED .					

Topic: Recommendations for the xml:lang attribute (DC00816256)

Paragraph-level comments

The following table outlines the recommended use of the @xml:lang attribute in topics and maps. These recommendations ensure that DITA resources have an effective default language.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
This paragraph refers to "DITA resources", but the table column heading for these is "Object". I think we should be consistent and change "Object" to "Resource".	gjoseph	updated	comment	6/4/2022 10:08:57	
Changed to "DITA resource." Marking this comment as COMPLETED .	keberlein	updated	comment	11/4/2022 14:52:26	

Topic: Translation and localization (DA00508882)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
<p>This section doesn't seem to cover the @translate attribute, despite the implication on this topic that it would.</p>	dstevens	updated	comment	5/4/2022 15:11:48	
<p>Agreed. I was not sure whether to remove the mention of the @translate attribute from here or add content to an existing stub topic. I wanted to get this review OUT, so I commented the stub topic out from the submap. On first thought here's not a lot to say about about @translate, but maybe there is more to tease out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What the attribute does and supported tokens -- covered in the "Universal attributes" topic and would need to be reused here• Recommendations for the @translate attribute: Do we have any? Do we set @translate to "no" on certain elements in the grammar files?• Somewhere in this topic cluster -- maybe here, maybe in the container topic "Translation and localization" -- we need to mention appendix C6 "Element-by-element recommendations for translation". (That topic was not yet ready for review.)	keberlein	updated	comment	5/4/2022 23:07:54	
<p>Marking this comment as ACCEPTED.</p>					
<p>I've added the topic for "The translate attribute" back. It contains the following content. Marking this comment as COMPLETED.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The @translate attribute provides information about whether the content of an element is to be translated.</p> <p>The following values are valid: yes, no, and -dita-use-conref-target.</p> <p>A few elements have the @translate attribute set by default to no. These elements include <draft-comment> and <required-cleanup>, all elements that are designed to hold content that is not intended for publication.</p>	keberlein	updated	comment	12/4/2022 13:13:32	

The non-normative appendix, Element-by-element recommendations for translators, includes information on whether the element is block or inline, whether the element contents are likely to be suitable for translation, and whether the element has attributes whose values might need translation.

Paragraph-level comments

Topic: Processing expectations about the Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm (DC00816255)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Change the word "about" in this topic's title to "regarding", to be consistent with the title of the other processing expectations topic in this review. We should probably check this title globally for all processing expectations topics to ensure we're consistent across the entire spec.	gjoseph	updated	comment	6/4/2022 11:08:49	
Done. I don't think we need to worry about consistency in existing topics since these are the first of the type.	keberlein	updated	comment	6/4/2022 15:28:50	
Marking this comment as COMPLETE .					

Paragraph-level comments

Topic: Processing expectations regarding the xml:lang attribute (DC00816245)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Do we want to include anything about "appropriate for its language" includes direction unless overridden with @dir?	zlawson	updated	comment	10/4/2022 01:09:34	
I don't think so. @Robert?	keberlein	updated	comment	11/4/2022 14:49:05	
I don't think we want to get into detail about it, no - I	randerson	updated	comment	11/4/2022 20:06:21	

think others will do far better at that than the DITA spec will (like, the related xml:lang and dir external resources)

Marking this comment **CLOSED**.

keberlein updated comment 11/4/2022
20:07:16

Realized I read the initial question wrong, it's about whether we should call out that xml:lang influences direction rather than the more general "what is appropriate", but I still think it's not needed - the dir section here in the same section of the spec really should cover that

randerson updated comment 11/4/2022
20:08:00

Paragraph-level comments