Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N741

Date: 2000-06-20

Source: Japan

Title: Editorial Report for Super CJK 10.0 and FCD Ext-B

Action: Discussion at Editor's meeting of IRG #15

Status: Japanese Contribution

Distribution: IRG

0. Introduction

Japan has started a review of CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS EXTENSION-B as well as Super CJK 10.0. Even though full review is not completed yet, Japan noticed significant enough amount of the issues. This report is a categolized intrim report of the review. Japan believes that this report will give over all view of the natures of all different type of issues.

1. Missing character

The character J4-6E5C (JPN128) was included in SuperCJK9.0 as #26132, but this character is missing in SuperCJK10.0. Because there is no report in IRG N718, Japan thinks this is a simple editorial mistake of SuperCJK10.0 and it should be added to extension B repertoire.



2. Glyph Problem

In the FCD text, the following characters are shown with inappropriate glyphs, and they should be changed accordingly.

In the following tables, three glyphs are listed: FCD column shows the glyph which appears in the FCD text, JPN column shows the glyph which appeared in the Japan's proposal, and KXI column shows the image taken from Kangxi Dictionary (if one is available.)

The "Type" column shows the type of issue/requested action, as summarized below:

- A: The glyph in FCD should be replaced with that supplied by Japan.
- B: The glyph supplied by Japan looks more appropriate than that shown in FCD, although Japan feels Editors need more discussion in this case.
- C: Japan wants Editors to discuss.
- D: Japan thinks the glyph has a little problem but does not propose any glyph change in this case. (The glyphs classified 'D' is included just for information for Editors' discussion.)

List of problematic glyphs (of category A, B, and C):

List of proble						
Codepoint	FCD	JPN	KXI	Type	Cause/Comments	
2-050A	42	14		С	SuperCJK 10.0 states that this character in Ext-B	
	大	7			FCD unifies J4-2327, but Japan is still	
20170	,				uncomfortable with this dicision.	
2-0AD8	/			С	SuperCJK 10.0 states that this character in Ext-B	
	Δ	4	4		FCD unifies J4-2359, but Japan is still	
2 127E	, ,			D	unfomfortable with this dicision.	
2-127F	十二	+		В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like	
	リ	4			"Kangxi style," because of the shape of "戸" part.	
2-1656	北北	###		A	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	一类	一些大			listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
					glyphs.	
2-1717	4 44	4.71	131	A	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	以巴	以巴	吧		listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
	/ !				glyphs.	
2-3809	ト年	七年	/	В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like	
		们具			"Kangxi style," because of the shape of ": part	
2-5B20	~~- ~~-	//// -	A.L.	A	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	1	计计	番		listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
			ت ر		glyphs.	
2-5E91	عبد	744	ોંટ	A	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	省		否		listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
		-1	-		glyphs.	
2-6011	1,+	V-1-		В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like	
	一芸们	洲			"Kangxi style," because of the shape of the "糸"	
2-603D	71111	/	$\overline{}$	В	part.	
2-003D	ℲℲ	公川		В		
	WXH	<u> </u>				
2-6048	华	么土		В		
	例	祁小				
2-6433	4455	JKK	dre	Α	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	 	VIV	771		listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
	1174	11/4	11.4		glyphs.	
2-6FC4	本	## <u></u>		С	The glyphs shown in FCD and in Japan's proposal	
	悟	馬			are more or less like Kangxi style. Which should	
		ı⊨			be used for Ext-B?	
2-713E	花	宝茄	主共	С	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like	
	一拼孔	「禁化」	翔		Kangxi-style in shape of "羽" part, while FCD	
					looks more in shape of "艸". Which glyph should	
					be used for Ext-B?	
2-7782	计性	上	1#	A	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	何更	作画	作用		listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
	123		1,54		glyphs.	
2-82AE	自穴	的大		В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like	
	分谷	粉			"Kangxi style," because of the shape of "," part	
	/ 4 FT	~→ 1→			and "身" part.	
2-8445	44	جاب		A	The glyph supplied by Japan is most close to that	
	羊	主	主		listed in Kangxi Dictionary among proposed	
	"		•		glyphs.	
2-8E70	7.17	775		В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like	
) `	 1)41,			"Kangxi style," because of the shape of "平" part.	
			/			

Codepoint	FCD	JPN	KXI	Туре	Cause/Comments
2-978E	鉉	鰦		В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like "Kangxi style," because of the shape of "食" part.
2-9AB1	羯	悩		В	The glyph supplied by Japan looks more like "Kangxi style," because of the shape of "月" part in "骨" part.

List of glyphs of category D:

List of gryphs of category D.					
Codepoint	FCD	JPN	KXI	Type	Cause/Comments
2-3762	櫟	楪		D	
2-5276	胳	嗒	胳	D	
2-6A0F	硟	艇	硟	D	
2-6D0E	募	夢	募	D	
2-9F1B	鯔	嬔	癬	D	

3. Known glyph errors not reflected in FCD

In the IRG Document N718, several glyph errors found in SCJK 9.0 is liste. However, we found some of them are not yet reflected in FCD text of Extension B, or, corrections done are questionable. Clarification and/or verification by Editors is needed.

The following is the list of such characters (glyphs.)

SCJK 9.0	SCJK 10.0	Ext-B (FCD)
Serial no.	serial no.	code point
63314	63287	2-95CC
01565	N/A	2-0305?
03855	03860	2-08E1
04072	04077	2-0976
70160	70130	2-A6BE
44328	44336	2-68FE

4. Printing Quality

Quality of print result should be improved.

Some examples of unacceptable quality of print result and/or font follow:

• Unclear in print:

Super CJK 10.0 22811

• Mixture of different style in each component:

Ext-B 2-8DC3, 2-8DF3

• Using components in the same style but in different thickness of strokes:

Ext-B 2-8DA7

Above are problems within one ideograph. Besides, there is a design balance issues; Japan does not like the unbalanced design. However, Japan does not have firm opinion whether if those shoule be adjusted or

not. Based on its practical production difficulty, Japan considers that those "unbalance" issue is less important than the issue of single glyph discussed above.

Details of such unbalance includes:

- Total thickness difference such as between 2-8DE2 and 2-8DF2 is not good also, but in practice those differences should be accepted.
- Difference in size such as between 2-0078 and 2-0079 is not good, but it is a subject for discussion at IRG for practical purpose.
- Fortunately, no significant type face style difference is discovered. (even though design parameters in same type face varies very much.)