

Open questions (on Pitman Glyphs) requiring further discussion with UTC

The proposal document **[L2/15-116r]** was reviewed by various Experts who provided their comments and suggestions for further improvement and correction.

The review comments of the Expert Stanislav Jan Šarman were discussed and although most of them were agreed upon and implemented in the revised proposal document, still there are a couple of comments/feedbacks pending cognizance, which are open for further discussions. Hereby, request UTC to provide their point of view.

Comments and suggestions provided by Experts.

1. Inclusion of logograms based on their relative positions.

Expert's comment: Stanislav Jan Šarman suggested for inclusion of all logograms in the proposal document. His point of view was that, there should be separate encoded characters for each of the logograms.

Proposal Author's comment: Except for a couple of logograms that are defined in the revised proposal document of date 01-May-2016, the author observed, other logograms can be handled using the proposed characters itself and there is no need to encode all logograms using separate characters. This is being reviewed and discussed with the Expert.

2. Inclusion of vowels based on their relative positions.

Expert's comment: Stanislav Jan Šarman suggested that, each Pitman vowel's along with their relative positions should be included (for encoding) as part of the proposal.

Expert's comment: Whereas, another expert Duncan McKenzie had a different opinion. He proposed only the 4 basic vowels (1 light dot, 1 light dash, 1 heavy dot and 1 heavy dash) may suffice for being encoded. His point of view was, the position of the Vowel's shall vary with consonants with which they are used. Therefore, instead of defining each and every position for vowels, the four basic vowels can be used, but their position can be managed/controlled using software while rendering output.

Proposal Author's comment: Has the same view point like Duncan McKenzie. In the revised proposal document, the 4 vowels proposed in the earlier version **[L2/15-116r]** are retained. This is being reviewed and discussed with Stanislav Jan Šarman.

3. Inclusion of heavy forms of Glyphs in the proposal document.

Expert's comment: Duncan McKenzie while reviewing the proposal document earlier, suggested for including heavy forms of Glyphs to look natural as per handwritten Pitman script (when rendered). He mentioned heavy forms are only optional. Also, heavy forms of glyphs are not part of standard Pitman character sets.

Expert's comment: Stanislav Jan Šarman also suggested there is no need to define separate characters for heavy hooks.

Proposal Author's comment: These heavy glyphs were included only as optional characters in the earlier proposal document but are removed in the revised version. Please refer to revised proposal document dated 01-May-2016 (point 1 in revision history) for detailed comments.