

## Analysis of comments for Malayalam script LGR Proposal for the Root Zone

Revision: 23 June 2020

Neo-Brahmi Generation Panel (NBGP) published the updated Malayalam script LGR Proposal for the Root Zone for public comment on 7 May 2020. This document is an additional document of The public comment report, collecting NBGP analyses as well as the concluded responses. There are two (2) comment submissions. The analyses are as follow:

No.	1	From	Wil Tan (WT)
Comment	<p>There is a potential cross-script variant relationship between U+0D1F (S) MALAYALAM LETTER TTA and U+0073 (s) LATIN SMALL LETTER S, as well as U+0455 (s) CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER DZE. These are listed in Appendix B as similar code points. The code point U+0D1F may be also combined with another Malayalam code point U+0D20 (O) MALAYALAM LETTER TTHA to produce labels that are identical to Latin labels composed of the letters ‘s’ and ‘o’.</p> <p><b>WT</b> suggests that no change required to the Malayalam LGR proposal. However, this should be considered for inclusion in the Latin LGR proposal when it is submitted.</p>		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges the comment.		
NBGP Concluded Response	No requirement to update the proposal.		

No.	2	From	Liang Hai (LH)
Comment	<p><b>LH</b> raises no objection to the the solution on ‘nta’ and provides following detailed feedback.</p> <p><b>LH1</b> notes that the case of ‘nta’ and Tamil LGR two srī (&lt;0BB8 SA, 0BCD VIRAMA, 0BB0 RA, 0BC0 VOWEL SIGN II&gt; and &lt;0BB6 SHA, 0BCD VIRAMA, 0BB0 RA, 0BC0 VOWEL SIGN II&gt;) are similar. Therefore, the types of variants should be the same, or more explanation is required if they are different.</p>		

	<p><b>LH2</b> suggests that, as the updated proposal attempts to correct the inconsistency in how nta is treated in the published LGR-3, an itemized change log should be provided.</p> <p><b>LH3</b> comments that on page 22, table 9, additional glyph for case 1b should be added to explain the failed shaping case. In addition, the second glyph in the 3b row, Glyph cell, should be removed.</p> <p><b>LH4</b> raises that using the sentence “Microsoft fonts have encoded nta ...” might be misleading as Windows’s text shaping engine does not support the sequence. He refers to Section 5 and Table 1 in L2/19-345R2 (<a href="https://www.unicode.org/L2/L2019/19345r2-malayalam-nta.pdf">https://www.unicode.org/L2/L2019/19345r2-malayalam-nta.pdf</a>) for more information on a Windows platform behavior.</p>
<p>NBGP Analysis</p>	<p>LH1. The case for ‘nta’ and Tamil Shri are not the same in the term of usage. Therefore, the variant types do not need to be the same.</p> <p>LH2. This comment will be addressed by the Integration Panel as part of the Malayalam LGR in RZ-LGR-4 release.</p> <p>The GP will review and incorporate the suggestion LH3 and LH4.</p>
<p>NBGP Concluded Response</p>	<p>The proposal will be updated as per suggested in LH3 and LH4.</p>