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 references to topics and maps 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.	sdoherty	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. Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	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? ------ Discussed with Robert on our spec editors' call today. We cannot think of a better way to describe what a map is	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:23:03	

succinctly enough for a short description.

Marking this comment **CLOSED.**

| Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date
When I went back to review the comments on this review, I kept thinking about this. While I don't think we can change the short description, your comment made me think. Maybe we should explain what we mean by "defining a context for those references" in the "Usage information" section? When I looked at the "Usage information" section, I saw that it entirely dealt with navigational links defined in a map. Not surprising, since it was probably authored in DITA 1.0 -- and just edited since then. I think we need to discuss (at least a little) what we mean by "defining a context for those references here in usage information. And maybe some of the content about the links created by relationships should be moved or removed. Changing the status of your comment to **ACCEPTED.**	keberlein	new	comment	2/12/2021 13:03:09

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 ; . t These references are organized into hierarchies, groups, and tables.	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 14:13:13	
Done Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:26:02	

be something? Does Family relate to a relationship table and I just haven't thought about it?

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?

Based on today's spec editors' call: Added that paragraph.

Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**

| | keberlein | updated comment | 22/11/2021 12:40:41 | |

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." Robert, your thoughts?	keberlein		updated comment	22/11/2021 17:44:06	
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	
Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	keberlein		updated comment	2/12/2021 12:00:40	

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 ~~; it~~ and 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 Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**	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	
Working with keys would be not rendering, but processing. Hmmm ... Does this topic need a "Processing expectations" section that contains a link to the current 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. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 12:47:35	

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	sdoherty	updated	change	18/11/2021 14:43:25	

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.

I'm going to leave the wording as-is, for two reasons:

- 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.
- The IBM styleguide calls for using a comma to separate the two parts of the sentence.

Marking this comment **CLOSED.**

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"?	sdoherty	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 ... Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	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	zlawson	updated comment		22/11/2021 01:36:09	

InstallingWidget, ConfigureWidget, IntegrateWithSprocket, CreateFirstWidget ?

Unfortunately I don't have any idea about the family relationship.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date
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? 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). Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated comment	22/11/2021 12:29:12

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: • Links from topics to external resources, for example, troubleshooting tips in a service knowledgebase • Source and target linking	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 17:14:00	
Based on spec editors' call today: Add this as work item on our running list. But we do have higher-priority items to handle. Marking this as **DEFERRED.**	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
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 ~~u definescontaincons~~ references to topics such that: ~~uses~~ the first column contains ~~to contain references to~~ task topics, ~~while~~ the second column contains concepts, and the third column contains s ~~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.	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: "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. A frequently-used type of relationship table uses the following structure: • The first column contains references to task topics. • The second column contains reference to concept topics. • 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. Marked as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 17:10:44	

Relationship tables also can be used in conjunction with hierarchies and groups to manage all the related links in an information set.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Relationship tables can also ~~can~~ be used in conjunction with hierarchies and groups to manage all the related links in an information set.	gjoseph	updated	change	25/11/2021 18:47:10	
The word "also" has already been removed from the sentence. Marked comment as **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	25/11/2021 19:54:16	

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". Marking comment as **DEFERRED** (we will TRY to improve this for DITA 2.0, but we are not committing to doing so.)	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	updated	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	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:58:15	

inconsistent and something that we should fix? Maybe.

IBM style guidelines (which we use) call for the following:

- Avoid long compund phrases and noun strings; use hyphens when appropriate.
- Use hyphens to avoid ambiguity, but do not use them unnecessarily.

I think the question is what is unnecessary usage. I'll post this to the list, and hopefully someone will do some research about hyphenation, writing for translation, etc.

Marking this comment as **ACCEPTED.** That indicates that we need to do some additional thinking on the issue, but can close out this review.

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 chamge in the DITA topic. Thanks for your review. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 11:59:51	
I agree as well	esirois	updated comment		22/11/2021 22:03:21	

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes , link-relationship attributes , common map attributes (excluding `@chunk` and `@collection-type`), `@keys` , `@keyref` , and the attributes defined below.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
The following attributes are available on this element:	gjoseph	updated change		25/11/2021	

universal attributes, link-relationship attributes, common map attributes (excluding @chunk and @collection-type), @keys, and @keyref , and the attributes defined below.

20:12:12

Done

Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**

keberlein updated comment 25/11/2021 22:15:17

Topic: relcolspec (DA00509259)

Paragraph-level comments

Adding a `<topicref>` element to the `<relcolspec>` element defines a relationship between the topic (or topics) that are contained within the `<relcolspec>` element and the topics that are referenced in the column of the relationship table. Note that this does not define a relationship between two cells in the same column; the only new relationship is between `<topicref>` targets in a `<relcell>` and `<topicref>` targets in that `<relcolspec>` of a column.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Adding a element to the element defines a relationship between the topic (or topics) that are contained within the element and the topics that are referenced in the column of the relationship table. Note that this does not define a relationship between two cells in the same column . ; t T he only new This relationship is between targets in a and targets in that the of a column.	gjoseph	updated	change	25/11/2021 15:50:41	
I think we can simplify this further by chaging the second sentence to read "Note that this does not define a relationship between two cells in the same column." Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	25/11/2021 19:45:36	

- If the `<relcolspec>` element contains a `<topicref>` element that specifies a navigation title, that navigation title is used for the label.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
What if more than onein thecontains a title? Should we state that the first one should be used, or let it be processor dependant? I lean towards suggesting that the first title be used. Thoughts?	gjoseph	updated	comment	25/11/2021 15:56:54	
	keberlein	updated	comment	25/11/2021	

Yu can only insert a single title element in a relcolspec, so this is a moot point.

Marking this comment **CLOSED.**

19:39:03

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 ... Zoe, I think here we are primarily referring to type and format attributes ...	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 13:10:48	
I don't think we need to be explicit here about which attriburtes 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 implementions will not differ.	randerson	updated comment		22/11/2021 21:42:09	
Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated comment		2/12/2021 12:20:53	

Example

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Example s	gjoseph	updated	change	25/11/2021 15:58:56	
Done Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	25/11/2021 19:43:18	

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 <topicmeta> element is also available...), namely to indicate that <topicmeta> 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 <topicmeta> 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: • We mentioned topicmeta separately, because it is NOT used for "referencing and organizing topics," just specifying metadata. • I learned from IBM editors that the phrasing "also is available" is better than "is also available" -- and 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?	keberlein	updated comment		23/11/2021 00:02:05	
Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated comment		1/12/2021 18:16:43	

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

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 ~~also~~ are also available inside the topic prolog.	gjoseph	updated change	22/11/2021 13:34:59
See my response to Frank Wegmann's comment on the shortdesc. Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	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." (or something of that nature)	nharrison	updated comment		20/11/2021 22:08:05	
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. However, we are not immediately making such a change in this topic; we need to do it systematically across ALL element-reference topics.	keberlein	updated comment		21/11/2021 09:36:17	

Marking this as **ACCEPTED.**

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 ... ------ 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. Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:49:01	

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

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Th e is 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 <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: • Changes to many element reference topics • Changes to our stylesheets 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 ...	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 17:18:50	
The whole section is itself an example, using the <example> element, which works in DITA 1.3 and 2.0. 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.	randerson	updated comment		22/11/2021 21:24:48	
Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated comment		2/12/2021 11:53:25	

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 <image>.	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:11:22	
Good eye! I've made the correction. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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 <keydef> and get it inserted as a change... In any case, the @keys value should be " **product**-name", not " **company**-name". 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	
• Changed to keydef keys="product-name" . You are never going to be able to select a part of a codeblock element, only the element itself. • 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	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 15:47:42	

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.

Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**

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.	sdoherty	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. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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: "Once processed, the effective text content of both <ph keyref="company-name"/> and <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.**	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 19:19:20	

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.

Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**

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 desdcription doesn't mention that, only strikethrough. Perhaps: Line-through refers to a strikethrough, which is a typographical presentations... Or you could use the phrasing from <u>: A line-through, also called a strikethough, is a ...	nharrison	updated comment		20/11/2021 21:47:26	
This one is tricky. The term "strikethrough" is the technically correct term; see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strikethrough . "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. 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." -------	keberlein	updated comment		21/11/2021 09:29:09	

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

Marked as **COMPLETED.**

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
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". 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.	gjoseph	updated	comment	22/11/2021 13:41:43	
I've recast the shortdesc (provisionally) as follows: "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." I've also changed the "Usage information" section to read as follows: "The anchor element typically is used to allow integration of run-time components. Another map can reference the anchor by using an anchorredelement 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." Robert, what do you think? ------------ Discussed at spec editors' call today; OK to go. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:16:37	

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"?	sdoherty	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. Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	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 s	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:56:02	
Removed the unecessary figures, so that it is one example. Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	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 nother DITA map using the @anchorref attribute:	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:45:08	
Done Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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) Rendered or inserted? Rendered is probably the correct processing term, but inserted is how my brain understands it better.	zlawson	updated	comment	22/11/2021 01:06:55	
Corrected! Yes, rendered is the corrected term. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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 ~~can be~~ rendered at the "a1" anchor in the MyComponent task map	gjoseph	updated	change	22/11/2021 13:46:12	
Duplicate of Zoe's comments Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	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
	shudson	updated	change	22/11/2021	

The topicmeta element defines ~~Topic metadata is~~ metadata that applies to a topic based the given ~~on its~~ context of that topic - in a map.

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.

Marking this comment **CLOSED.**

keberlein updated comment 22/11/2021 17:22:02

Topic: topichead (DA00509178)

Paragraph-level comments

A topic head is a title-only entry in a DITA map.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
I think we should add the text about this being a convenience element, like we do with the other convenience elements.	gjoseph	updated comment		25/11/2021 20:26:02	
Already added, based on another reviewer's comment. Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated comment		25/11/2021 22:18:38	

The content of the `<titlealt>` element with a `@title-role` of `<navigation>`, such as `<navtitle>`, appears as a heading when the map is rendered as a table of contents. In print contexts, it also appears as a heading in the rendered content.

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
Something is wrong with this sentence. I read it several times and don't know what is being said. How can the <tilealt> element have an @title-role of <navigation>?? Should it be "navigation"? I also don't understand the "such as <navtitle> part of this sentence. Please rework to make it clear what the rendering should do.	gjoseph	updated comment		25/11/2021 20:29:23	
A titlealt element with @title-role set to "navigation" is the equivalent of a navtitle element. So, here we are talking about the rendering expectations for a topichead element that contains a navtitle.	keberlein	updated comment		25/11/2021 22:24:25	

Changed the paragraph to read: "When the navigation title associated with a topichead element is rendered, it appears as a heading in a table of contents. In print contexts, it also appears as a heading in the rendered content."

Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**

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.	sdoherty	updated	change	18/11/2021 14:53:57	
Corrected the spelling of the element name. Thanks for catching that! Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	20/11/2021 17:50:49	

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	
Corrected! Marking this comment as **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	2/12/2021 11:36:18	

After processing, the base-elements.ditamap contains the topic references that originally were located in the submap:

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date
I agree with Zoe. I was confused by the example in Figure 16, which is the effective outcome of the example in Figure 15. It should be collapsed into a single example.	gjoseph	updated comment		25/11/2021 20:09:03
I've done the following: • Changed the title of the section to "Example" • Removed the figures and associated titles Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated comment		25/11/2021 22:36:24

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. ---------- Made the change Marking this comment **COMPLETED.**	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 13:13:34	
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. Content removed. Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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 <navref>? If you provide the example of topicref, shouldn't you also include an exampe of <mapref>?	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. ------------ Removed the content and the draft comment Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	keberlein		updated comment	22/11/2021 17:25:44	
+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 **set on the** cell indicates that they are related." Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	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 on the cell indicates that they are related.	shudson	updated	change	22/11/2021 16:35:42	
Duplicate of Zoe's above comment. Marking this comment **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated	comment	22/11/2021 16:46:37	

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes and common map attributes (without `@keyscope`), `@type` , `@scope` , `@format` .

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
	gjoseph	updated	comment	25/11/2021 15:45:59	
I wonder if the attribute list would be better rendered as a list? This one does read right. The "and" should be moved to the end. But I think the parenthesis text would be better if we used a list for this. Without the list, the text should be:					

The following attributes are available on this element: universal attributes, common map attributes (without @keyscope), @type, @scope, and @format.

With the list, the text would be:

The following attributes are available on this element:

- universal attributes
- common map attributes except @keyscope
- @type
- @scope
- @format

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date
Changing the format of how attributes are handled would be considerable work -- and take up more space in the PDF. I wouldn't advocate for this. Robert? Also, it would obliviate the currrent distinction that we make between "stock attribute groups," and elements that have unique attributes. Marking this comment **REJECTED.**	keberlein	updated comment		25/11/2021 19:35:45
Definitely correct that we need to move the "and" in that sentence, when reworking this one I missed that. Back in DITA 1.3 we prototyped lists at one point, and I really did not think it looked good - we had a lot of very simple lists that were just links to attributes, which added a lot of space and did not seem any more useful. Most elements only have universal-attributes, and we don't want to have a single-item list. It also starts looks bad when you have standard attributes like the ones above (where we do not want to copy a definition inline), along with attributes unique to the element (which appear as a full definition list). Final comment - changing this would hit every element in the spec (and the tech-comm spec), and I don't think it is worth the cost at this point.	randerson	updated comment		1/12/2021 19:52:44

Topic: Emphasis domain elements (DC00810965)

Topic-level comments

Annotation	Reviewer	Status	Type	Date	Topic version
	zlawson	updated comment		22/11/2021	

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?				03:01:20
Good point ... I think not, because unlike audio and video, we do not base the design completely on the HTML5 element. Robert, your thoughts? ----------- Discussed at spec ediors' call today: We also don't want to add such info to all the highlighting domain topics. Marked as **CLOSED.**	keberlein	updated comment		22/11/2021 12:11:07
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? <topicref> with...something? (same for topichead) I also really like the example, it gives a good use case.	zlawson	updated comment		22/11/2021 03:25:41	
I don't think that topicgroup and topichead are convenience elements; I cannot think of how to accomplish what they do with a topicref 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 topicgroup to element. That's really only the case because it uses the new titlehint element, in DITA 1.3 you would not be able to put that hint in	randerson	updated comment		22/11/2021 21:48:55	

there because having a navtitle would make it exactly equivalent to a topichead.

Added the following content: "Theelement is a convenience element. It is equivalent to aelement without a navigation title or @href, @keys, @keyref attributes." Marking this comment as **COMPLETED.**	keberlein updated comment	22/11/2021 23:24:14

Paragraph-level comments