From: Henry Chan

Subject: Feedback to PRI 418: Registration of additional sequences in the MSARG collection

Date: September 11, 2020 at 23:10

Feedback from Henry Chan:

I have identified 3 issues in principle with the current MSARG collection.

- (1) For some of the characters, it seems the more commonly-used glyphs are registered as variants while the non-common forms are registered as the base character. For example, ME_4058_001 is used more compared to MD_4058, ME_25584_001 is more commonly used than MA_93C3, etc in Macao.
- (2) There appears to have been harmonization of glyph styles, as is apparent by ME_71AE_001 and ME_71BB_001, as the apparent form of 詡 is typically not combined with this form of 火, and ME_7ABO_001 where the form of the first stroke is not typically paired with such form of the fifth stroke. These harmonization attempts have created new glyph forms that do not typically exist otherwise. It would be beneficial for implementers if the nature of these harmonizations were clarified (mandatory vs stylistic), and a concrete list of harmonizable glyph forms were also provided for the public as part of MSCS standards.
- (3) There appears to be two major cases of wrongful harmonizations.
- (A) The form of 糸 in ME_7D89_001 and ME_7DAB_001. The two most common forms of 7D89 are as follows (G, H, T vs J, K, V):



The top and bottom part of % should be harmonized as a full component, and not broken up and the top part harmonized by itself. There are over 370 characters with a left side form of % in the URO alone. If the exact form is mandatory, the risk to implementations may be catastrophic.

(B) The form of $\stackrel{\cdot}{\to}$ in ME_9938_001 and ME_6A0B_001. The three most common forms of 6A0B are as follows (G vs H, T vs J, K, V):



The traditional two-dot-one-bent form of $\grave{\succeq}$ (as used by J/K/V in this instance) should be viewed as a single structure, and not a combination of a one dot and a one-dot-one-bent form of $\grave{\succeq}$ (as used by G in this instance). Hence, it should not be harmonized to one dot and one-dot-two-bent form of $\grave{\succeq}$. Either it should be kept as the two-dot-one-bent form, or harmonized to one-dot-two-bent form directly.

Yours, Henry