

Caleb (00:00):

Let's go ahead and get started. One of the things I want to think about around these round tables is we're in this transition now between software development and continual improvement. And so I thought today, one of the things I wanted to start with is this idea of maybe a little bit of a deeper dive into a feature area to serve as inspiration and how you might be able to use Orion or leverage some features that you may not have been using before, if you're coming from eXtyle, or just to raise awareness of some features that are in Orion. And all this sort of fits into this narrative arc around the, how do you say? It's the accessibility of the software. I'm not talking about accessibility from 508 compliance. I'm talking about accessibility as far as the idea that you are in control and that there's this plethora of options available to you.

(01:34):

And so to just kick things off, the idea is sort of three questions. Is your output valid? Does it meet your standards? And can we make it more useful? So what does this mean? First question, is it valid? One of the things that we've built with Orion is that you can validate against DTDs, you can validate against the schema, and you can validate using Schematron. And one of the interesting things about this is, especially on the Schematron side of things, you can control or choose what is the severity level of a particular flaw in your output. And so this is the first one I'm going to try to... Let's see, I need to stop sharing over here.

(02:42):

And I'm going to share over here. All right, so this is a document. You've seen this many times if you've been to previous round tables. This is one that Robin has already taken basically to the end. This is at the tail end of your workflow where you have all the content. It's all been tagged and marked up and looks nice, and we want to export it. So I have a new option I've added into my Export to XML menu of doing a validated pass. So I'm going to run this here, and this will take just a few minutes, but I'm going to kick it over to the server while this is running so we can talk about what we're actually doing in this job.

(03:40):

So this is the standard workflow that we have for our export. And what I'm really interested in is down here at the bottom. So we export out into our XML, and then here, instead of using just straight up DTD validation, I'm using Schematron. This is actually running the Taylor and Francis version 2.1 Schematron to validate the content. And then that produces a report that says, here are all the things that are problematic with that document. And here is that same report now integrated right back into the export from the XML so I can actually see where these problems happened. I get the message from that report. We can define these things as part of the Schematron rules, and I'll show a little bit more about that a little bit later. But the idea being now that we can say, yes. Is our content valid? Yes.

(04:46):

Is our content, fit the standards that we have? This is a start of that to say, well, hey, we require certain things to be in certain places. These are higher level standards.

(05:03):

Because when we think about from a... Let's see. Stop the share here and back over here. When we think about standards, just being valid does not mean it is correct. And so when we think about some of these business rules that you might apply to your content, a better way of thinking about these rules is rather than just tacking it into the end of the workflow, I want to incorporate it into the flow of my content. So what does that mean? So in this particular document. Let me get this thing out of the way. I've sort of embedded a couple errors in the process. So I have two different business rules that I have set up as a demonstration to show this. The advisory rules say I want to see the things, but don't stop the job. Just tell me all the problems and I'll deal with it at that point.

(06:31):

So if I run this workflow, and it'll give me just a second, and you'll see that I'm not producing in XML. I'm starting from my Word document and it is flagging quality control issues in this document. Again, each of these are showing up as an annotation, a comment within here explaining here's the rule that failed, what the class is, error versus a warning versus an info, and an explanation of what we're looking for. All of this is managed directly through a rule set. And so this is an example of those first few comments that we had where it's a standard Schematron pattern match looking for certain things. Do we have a data availability statement? If so, this rule does not fire. If we're missing that paragraph, then this rule fires and it provides this error message. It's a really straightforward way to start to look at your content and how can we make it better before we get to the end.

(08:00):

Because oftentimes it's cheaper and easier to make changes while you're in the moment as opposed to at the tail end of the workflow.

(08:13):

All right, getting back. So third question, can we make it more useful? And this is the last sort of demo before I want to just have more of an open mic discussion with you and think about the further direction of Orion and where you want us to take it. So the first stage here is looking at, we want to enrich that content. We want to identify certain things within this content and tag them and link them to a database. This is obviously very much around protein and gene sequences and so forth. And this is about reproducibility. This is about linking that content as we go. This is actually sort of an interesting challenge, and there's an overlap between what this accession linking does and sort of what SmartReplace does. SmartReplace is about looking for patterns in the content. And what the accession linking does that's above and beyond the SmartReplace is that you also have this.

(09:38):

Well, you have some challenges with some of these databases where their identifiers are not unmistakable. OMIM, gene IDs, PDB, they're identifiers. PDB, the old style PDB is just four alphanumeric characters, which could collide with a lot of different things. They're four-letter words and product IDs that should not be linked to this database. And so where our accession linking goes above and beyond is that we're using positive and negative indicators. We're looking around the context to see, does this match the profile of a link or not? And so that's how we work it. But the cool thing about the way that we've built the succession linking is that it is extensible. And so you can actually add your own patterns to your own sources. And so we support, I think, 26, because some of these items here actually cover multiple databases. Support 26 different databases. We can add more and we are going to be adding even more to that.

(11:05):

So let's get into that demo again.

(11:12):

All right. So here we have all of the quality control things are still listed. I don't need to worry about them. I can run my accession linking and RRID linking as well. These are research resource IDs. Again, this is like an accession link, but it's just going to a different database. And here we have that. So you can see that we have a gene ID is tagged and linked to the actual record posted through NCBI. A couple more accession links with their patterns. And then you'll see in this table we've identified all the RRDs. And so I can click to follow any of these and it takes me directly to the location. And so I can see information about this antibody and go to the source. This is just like a DOI, but for a piece of information as opposed to the article itself.

(12:31):

And actually, yeah. So that is the start of where I wanted to look at what is next? What can we do to start to enable deeper integrations in your workflow to enable you to validate, to improve the quality of your

content through inline checking? And then also how can we help you enrich that content to identify pieces of information that are useful for others in their consumption of your content? And that is the opening salvo. I wanted to give a lot more time to discussion with you. And so that is that. I saw there was a chat that came through, but I don't have my chat window.

Guy ([13:36](#)):

The main question was on which XML are these Schematrons running? On the first one, I know that that was the JATS XML. On the second one where it came back into the Word file, that's also running on the JATS XML?

Caleb ([13:51](#)):

No.

Guy ([13:51](#)):

No, that's what I thought.

Caleb ([13:53](#)):

Yeah. So the idea behind, we have different surfaces. And so with DTD validation and the schema validation, XSD, those are going to be both running at the end of your process. That is just checking, does this content fit a pretty fixed standard? Here's what it should look like. But there's no judgement call in that as far as quality. Then that's where Schematron gives you access to say, well, yes, these things need to be in the document, present, but present doesn't mean correct to our style. We may have simple rules around formatting dates or the fact that this element that's defined in the schema, like the data availability, that has to be in your content, you have to have that. That's part of your standards that if you don't have that statement, but a DTD just says, if this is here, this is what it looks like.

([15:15](#)):

If it's not here, that's okay. There's no judgement call there where the Schematron is something that you can apply that. In Schematron, you can create the rules that actually work in line with Orion because our workflow goes from Microsoft Word into Content XML back to Microsoft Word. And so in that Content XML side of things, that's where you would apply your Schematron rules to make sure that things adhere to your standards. And you could apply them at the end if you wanted to do JATS4R. JATS4R is supplied as a collection of Schematron. And so that's something that it's targeting a JATS output. So you have to run the JATS4R process at the tail end. It's just where you apply it and how you are shaping those rules.

Robin ([16:18](#)):

Can I just jump in there, Caleb?

Caleb ([16:20](#)):

Yes.

Robin ([16:20](#)):

To say some of you on the call with long memories will know that we discussed this repeatedly at XUG, at eXtyle's User Group meetings. The possibility, particularly the possibility to do these kind of checks in the Word file, because you've got the difference as Caleb said there between something like, is there just one corresponding author or something like that? Versus you can have rules like the abstract must be no more than 200 words. The short title can't have more than 45 characters. These are the kinds of content rules that you really want to run those on the Word file because you want to fix them in the Word file. If

the short title's too long, if the abstract is too long, you don't want to have that, know that when you've got XML, then you've got to get back to the Word file and then you've got to change it there and then you've got to make new XML again.

(17:06):

So this opportunity to run it on the CXML, that opens up this kind of thing now so we can. I don't know whether you had any particular warning. So you had one about having no teaser. These are the kind of things that you want to know in the Word file. You don't want to be told once you've got your XML and fix it in the Word file and make new XML.

Caleb (17:26):

Yep. And things like this one where this is the name, it's hard to see because it's highlighted the whole thing, but I intentionally styled. Let me just accept this.

Robin (17:45):

I think you'll have to delete it too.

Caleb (17:47):

Yeah, I got to delete it. So when I delete it, you'll see that De Souza has been tagged as two different pieces instead of one continuous. So I did that intentionally to force it to say, "Hey, you can't have two last names." It's reading that as two different words. Similarly, having two correspondences. You can set the rules however you like, and the rule themselves are pretty straightforward to look at. Here's my test. Do I have a teaser? It's just up or down. Other tests can be a little more complicated. Like here, this one is the last name where I'm saying, okay, counting the number of first names and surnames, do they match as that? Yeah, this is one I just threw in. It's impossible to see it in the document, but there's a discretionary hyphen that I put into the author text. And so it's not visible in the Word document unless you change the margins.

(19:19):

But yeah, the idea here is writing the Schematron rules, running against the Content XML, and that gives me the ability to integrate the report back into the file so you can see the context of where the issue occurred.

Guy (19:43):

I think this is so cool.

(19:45):

I might be slightly biased. And I think it also fits into this picture of. There's a lot of work happening on Orion, the onboarding of customers and all that other stuff. But we also want to focus on, everything that we've been communicating is we obviously want to give you the experience as much as possible of what you're already used to from eXtyle to facilitate that transition. But we're looking at what the future is bringing. And this is definitely a part of what we feel the future of Orion would be, that we'll take it beyond what was possible by default in eXtyle.

(20:31):

Yeah, I think that's very exciting. I think that there was no other questions around this, but there's now a question from Patrick. Could this be applied to errors in the InDesign composition? I mean, Schematron and a Schematron validation on the CXML that goes into InDesign, absolutely. I think you muted yourself maybe Caleb, because I'm seeing your lips move. But yeah, it is absolutely possible to use this. I presume it's possible to use the same tool. Yeah, I mean it's CXML, so it can absolutely be used to verify

the CXML. It's something that I would've been wanting to do for our InDesign composition-based customers for years. So this is one of those things where the benefits of us having or wanting to do this for Orion absolutely go beyond just Orion. I think the question would be whether you would be using the same Schematron rules for your InDesign composition as you would for other things.

(21:47):

I can imagine that there's things you would need or not need in your InDesign composition that might be different from what you need to generate your XML. But the tool itself can absolutely be used to validate a CXML file. And I think one thing that would be different though is here with Orion, what we're demonstrating, everything goes back to a Word file. And when you're talking about your InDesign composition, Patrick, that is, there you start from the XML.

Caleb (22:23):

Yes.

Guy (22:24):

So that would be different. You wouldn't get a nice Word file saying this is wrong. But I can also imagine that there's some overlap where something needs to be in the XML, in the input XML in a certain way for it to move properly into InDesign composition. So I think there might be a little bit of overlap there.

Caleb (22:45):

Yep. So this is another thing that I hadn't demoed, but within the workflow itself, you have different behaviours on error. And so with my gated business rules, I have it set to report and then fail. And so this basically says if any of the errors rise above a warning to an actual error, the job stops. It doesn't allow it to proceed. And so I can demo that as well. So I'm going to run it against the. Actually, that's the wrong document. Over here. Run it against the gate. And what you'll see is the job just doesn't proceed. It does not complete because it forces it to fail on the server. And so when we looked at that job, we can see that it produced output, but the log here shows that it has issues that have been classified as errors. And because of those errors, it is forcing the job to stop.

(24:07):

There are two errors, three warnings, and one info. So this is another thing that you can incorporate into that workflow to have these gates so that content is not allowed to proceed unless it meets a certain bar.

(24:23):

And as Guy did say, this can be integrated into workflows beyond Orion. There's nothing Orion specific to validation. It's just a matter of how do you create your rules and what you are looking at. If I opened up the Taylor and Francis Schematron rules, it is thousands of lines. It's a 300 kilobyte-ish set of rules. It's a lot of things. This is a gate that they use before they accept something for press that they have documented and defined all of their standards. And so they can have a quick up and down vote on, is this content meet our standard, depending on how it comes out of their Schematron. And we can absolutely help you create your own sets of rules, but this is something that there are many people in the world that understand Schematron and can write it. It's a certain pattern of the way you write an XSLT.

(25:39):

That's sort of that.

Guy (25:42):

I had a question for the people here because I observed that there was somebody in the chat that said it was their first time back after a while. Oh, that was Luciano. So I remember that you joined the first ones.

So are there any people that are in our round table today that have absolutely never seen anything around Orion before and might have questions in that regard? I am seeing Jodi putting up her hand, putting up her hand. There's a couple more. Greg and Victoria. Hi, welcome. So one of the things that we were discussing the last time is that the last couple of round tables, we started with a complete introduction to what Orion was. And we're also a little bit like we've got to make sure I balance that with the amount of people that are returning. So welcome for the first ones.

(26:45):

And we'll work to give you some links to provide you at least with the videos and the things that give you the high level overview. But I was curious now that you're here, if there's any questions or anything that you might've had coming into this round table that you'd want us to address.

(27:09):

Let me check if there's...

Robin (27:13):

Yeah, Travis says he's got several new CFA people on the call today.

Guy (27:17):

Oh, cool. Welcome all.

Trevor (27:19):

Yeah, we've just added a few new people that I wanted to start getting familiar with, but they're all going to be part of our ongoing work.

Guy (27:29):

Cool. Awesome. Thank you. So I presume you're sharing the videos from the past with them and all that good stuff.

Trevor (27:37):

Yeah, Yeah. We'll take care of all that. We don't expect you to train everyone up.

Guy (27:43):

I wanted to make sure that we address that there's always going to be new people and there's going to be people that have seen a couple of these, and we want to make sure that we cater to both in these sessions in terms of the feedback. I think one of the other things, Caleb, that might be useful is to do a quick. As we discussed, this was a main focus in this month of work that we're going to do. I think it will be good in leading up to the next round table that we spend a little bit of time sharing with the people. I don't think we've had time to do slides for that, but I don't think that's necessary. Just talking through what our focus is for the next month in terms of the work that we're doing.

(28:31):

I think that's a good one. If I am to start right now, the team and I are completing the testing on or in the process of testing Orion for Word v1.5, which is going to be, I think we're fixing upwards of 30 smaller and bigger issues. Monica, you'll be happy to hear that we fixed the issue where errors can appear behind windows instead of at the top. Warnings, that kind of thing, which is something that obviously it has an impact on you as a user if you're missing things. So there's going to be a whole bunch of those quality of life improvements in Orion for Word 1.5, and we're working hard to complete the testing on that. Some issues were actually reported this week and we're working hard to integrate those as well. So my

expectation is that within the next two weeks, we should have publicly available the new version of Orion for Word coming along.

(29:34):

Yeah, cool.

Caleb (29:35):

Yeah. So this is just sort of the high level roadmap. This is the same roadmap that we showed at our June round table. Nothing has moved here. You can see that we've sort of split this in two quarters. And so some of the stuff has already shipped. So in the July to September slot, you can see that SmartRefs v4, we just released that one. The persistent ID linking, that's accession linking and RRIDs that I just demoed today. Things that are also coming down the pipe. We just talked about the Orion Word v1.5. Orion SI, our service integration side of things. This is the Orion that runs completely on the server. And so this is for integrating into lights out type workflows where you feed a Word document into it and it runs through a series of tasks before it returns to you back a file that is further along in your workflow.

(30:53):

Or it could be something where you do things upfront and then you toss it over to Orion SI and it takes it from that point through to the end of the workflow. It just sort of depends on what your process might be. Other things that are coming, and we know there are a lot of people that are really anxious around the end of life of eXtles that's just a few weeks away.

(31:19):

But one of the things that we chose not to focus on in the first releases of Orion were the Insert Symbols menu. And so the first version of that is going to be appearing in Orion Word later this quarter. Moving the cleanup functions. This is going through and providing the mechanical cleanup to your document around white space and converting images into something that's usable. All of that is moving server side, which will also bring with it some pretty massive performance increases. So that's coming later this quarter. And then for those of you that are actually pushing your content into CrossRef or PubMed, being able to automate those deposits is also something that is scheduled for this July to September quarter. So lots of things on that.

Robin (32:29):

Justin has asked about an update on the SI timescale. Obviously cleanup version two is a key part of that.

Caleb (32:39):

Yeah, so the cleanup v2 is underway, and I hope to have that delivered in sort of the mid-August timeframe. And the nice thing about this is that's the last piece before SI is ready for that end-to-end. If you're interested in SI today, it can already be used for all of the existing workflows. It just cannot be used in that upfront piece. There are two components. One is we have to be able to attach a publication to the Word document. And so that is in QA right now. And the second piece is running through the cleanup stages. That's something that happens right now through the Microsoft Word interactively. And so as soon as that moves up to the server, then Orion SI has a capability of supporting you end-to-end. So if your workflows pick up after content has been cleaned up and you've done your paragraph styling, then you can actually be using SI today.

(34:05):

Any other questions? Let's see what's in the chat. Is there additional charge for SI? Yes. Just because it's available as a service and it's all API driven. There's a different charge for that compared to the interactive tool in Orion for Word. So that's one of the things that I've tried hard to steer clear of is getting into the money side of things. I design the product and the features and I leave the conversations around costs to

the other side of the business. So I would refer you to your sales contact and they can provide you with details around SI and what it means and so forth.

(35:13):

I wanted to ask a question around workflows because I think, was it Patrick, the one that brought up the InDesign composition? Yeah. How many of you are interested in that sort of true end to end, going Orion authoring to XML to publishing to PDF as your output? Because what we've seen is that we've got different levels of, I guess, depth in the workflow. There's some people that they're using Orion or they were using eXtyle just to do cleanup in the Word document. And so the final output was actually a Word document and that was handed off to somebody else and somebody else made it into the XML or HTML or PDF. And then there are others that were using it to go from Word to clean up to XML. And then again, someone else took that XML and did things with it. Who has thought about potentially doing that all in one? That I'm within Microsoft Word with Orion, and instead of an export to XML menu, I have an export to PDF and it's going to go all the way out to build that interactive rich PDF. Maybe.

Patrick (37:04):

Are you saying cut out the InDesign step?

Caleb (37:08):

Yes.

Patrick (37:09):

Oh. Yeah, I think we'd be interested in that.

Caleb (37:17):

Awesome. All right. CDA as well. CDC.

Trevor (37:28):

We would have interest in some version of that. Yeah.

Caleb (37:32):

Okay.

Trevor (37:33):

I mean, we're a little more complicated than that, but.

Caleb (37:38):

Yes, that's true.

Trevor (37:41):

But we've talked about what would be interesting in connection with our larger, more complex authoring ecosystem. If just for previewing, we could have an editorial team member simply go directly from Word to PDF via Orion, then you immediately generate a preview PDF and that would be a very interesting thing.

Caleb (38:07):

Yep. Monica, I see your hand up.

Monica ([38:15](#)):

Yeah, time may not permit here, but I'm wanting to understand the difference between the automation and the workflow that you can achieve with Compass and Orion versus what Orion SI provides. I mean, the distinction between eXtyle and eXtyle SI is very clear to me because I use it, but I'm confused about what. So for example, will the survey cleanup be included in the Orion that we have now, or would we have to get Orion SI?

Caleb ([38:56](#)):

Okay. The way that this works is basically Orion SI is the API access to all the same workflows that are running on the Typefi server. It's like a cover charge effectively. This gives you the ability to tie the same workflows that you are running from Orion Word to instead integrate them into other workflows. And the reason why there's a different charge related to this is a lot to do with bandwidth. That Orion Word is interactive inherently. That you are sitting at your desktop and you are manually running the steps one by one. With Orion SI, you create a larger workflow and you just drop a file in. It runs through all the steps as fast as possible and then returns that output to a destination of your choice. And so this is where you could have a custom front end, you could have a web interface that you accept submissions from, and those submissions then go through Orion SI to prepare them to a greater extent before they hit an editor's desk.

([40:32](#)):

Because that submission front end is unbounded. It could be anyone anywhere in the world all at once. There's a different service tier for SI versus running it in Word. But under the hood, behind the scenes, it's the exact same workflows. And so you don't have to have a different set of workflows for the cleanup. Once the cleanup moves to the server, then Orion Word will use that same server-side cleanup, and that's where the performance happens. This is what we saw with anyone that was an early adopter with SmartRefs. The first edition of SmartRefs ran entirely within Microsoft Word. And then the second edition of SmartRefs, we had moved to the server. And the time difference between the two. SmartRefs v1 could take 30, 40 minutes. It was blocking. You couldn't do anything else while it was running. SmartRefs v4 is now non-blocking, and so you can kick it off.

([41:48](#)):

The job might take 20 minutes if you had hundreds of references, but you can continue working in Word. And when the job is done, it takes seconds to show you the results. We expect a similar sort of performance increase when we move to the cleanup on the server. But again, underneath all of this, that SI is not about the workflows, it's about access to the workflows and enabling that through an API call from any front end that you might have. Does that make sense?

Monica ([42:35](#)):

I think so. I mean, I think the first use case, and I don't want to take too much time on this 'cause we can always just connect later, but the first use case I can think of for us would be, we have a pool of freelancers. Right now the model that we have is we have freelance coordinators in-house who use eXtyle to prepare the document. Then they send it to the freelancers to edit in Word. So we could potentially, using Orion SI, essentially make that work that those freelance coordinators do, your freelancers themselves could do. Yes. They would upload it via SI, it would run the processes. And the only problem is without automated styling. Anyway, we can talk about -

Caleb ([43:30](#)):

Yeah, you'll see in the October, December time slot that Auto Style is coming a little bit later. If we think about the evolution of cleanup, that there's the basic levels of cleanup and going through and, what do we do with white space? What do we do with comments? What do we do with hidden text? What do we do with embedded graphics and those sorts of things? Then the next stage from there is, okay, how do we apply a baseline set of styles to the content? How do we identify, this is a heading versus this is body content? This is a table heading row, this is a table body row, this is a table row head. All those sorts of things that gets into your auto styling. And then the holy grail is that I can drop an unstyled Word file in and I get fully structured rendered XML on the backend.

(44:45):

Everyone wants that.

(44:49):

And that is the holy grail because it is a challenge. That is not Auto Style version one. But we are going to continue to push toward how close we can get to that holy grail. And that's a lot of the future roadmap for Orion is applying that sort of intelligence and pattern matching and understanding, a deep understanding of the content that you're pushing through so that we can identify and provide that sort of level of markup. I don't think it's ever possible to... I mean, even if we were looking at AI for doing this, which I'm actually not, how close can we get to the judgement and the discernment and the editorial decisions that you make and what is quality? I think there's an intrinsic difference between quality and correctness. I don't know. I'm sure you guys all have opinions on this and where things are going.

(46:24):

But yeah, if we can get 80%, that would be a great target for us.

Monica (46:35):

Thanks Caleb.

Caleb (46:39):

All right. Any other questions? Non-export. Trevor, can you explain what you mean by non-export commenting?

Trevor (46:53):

Yeah, just simply using the original eXtyle non-export style. What we've often found is that around content blocks, we just like to write in, this is the start of this type of box. And so upfront you have to do a little bit of templating. You got to teach authors or you have to have somebody come in after authors. You can't just take an author's brand new Word document that they've written without guidance and autostyle it. But we've tried to, over the years, create more of that kind of structure in place to say, "Well, this is where we're going to insert this kind of thing." And from the basic prototyping I've done, that's a really great way to then pick up and map those kind of features to the more standardised use cases that we have.

Caleb (47:51):

Gotcha.

Trevor (47:52):

But that works if you're working on a certain number of repeated products or you've got the same kind of thing. If you're the kind of publisher that has 500 journals, it may not work quite the same way.

Caleb ([48:08](#)):

Yeah. But I mean, I think the idea is, and this is sort of getting into semantics and what the whole idea behind a schema is, is that you set a certain shape or pattern expectation in what the content should look like. And as long as your content adheres to the baseline pattern, it's easier to then repurpose it and reuse it. A lot of these ideas are getting into single source, and that's one of the things that Typefi is moving toward. So if you've known Typefi for years, what you're seeing now today is that we have two pillars that Orion is one pillar, and then our InDesign composition is another pillar. They can be linked, but it's not as integrated as it should be.

([49:29](#)):

And so one of the things that we're moving toward is we have Typefi Writer as a Microsoft Word tool, and then we have Typefi Orion as a Microsoft Word tool. They each do different things. And how can we move to an integrated layer? Maybe that they converge into one future tool that gives you an easier way to, again, tag and mark up your content so that you can choose what your output is. That it's not just as focused on, here's an XML export, or here is an InDesign export, but that it's a choose your own adventure side of things.

([50:18](#)):

Well, if there's nothing else that anyone wants to bring up, I just want to thank you again for you being with us on this journey. As you see in our roadmap, we have a lot of things that we are planning in the coming months. We know that there's a lot of interest in Orion, especially with the upcoming sunset of eXtyles. And we're excited about where we're going. We're excited about helping you get there. And I think I'll make a little plug if you haven't already signed up for the Balisage conference that's coming up, was it next week?

([51:16](#)):

This will be the last Balisage ever, I think, unless someone else decides to pick it up. But we're excited to be presenting there and talking about this journey. Guy's going to be doing a session talking about the way that we've developed Orion and how your input and these discussions and these round tables have really dramatically affected what we've delivered, how we've delivered it, the priorities for when we deliver it. So all of this is very much. I am thankful. I am grateful for all of you and your messages and comments and challenges. It's been a lot of fun. So thank you all. Oh, we got a couple last things coming up. Yeah, so Robin got it 100%. Version one is matching eXtyles, except the icons will look better.

Robin ([52:28](#)):

Yeah, I wasn't sure whether you meant the one-eighth, one-third, the single character glyphs that are represented in Unicode. You could do those with the existing eXtyles Insert Symbol and with version one of the Orion Insert Symbol. But if you wanted some more complex fraction or something with a numerator and a denominator and I can't remember, never remember what that line's called across the middle, horizontal, as an equation, then you would need SmartText to put that in.

Caleb ([53:01](#)):

Yep. Yeah, I mean the Insert Symbols version two will support ligatures and contextual alternates and combining characters and that sort of stuff. So it's not just inserting a single symbol. You'll be able to construct a pattern if you like. But yeah, when we get closer to that quarter, we will absolutely be demonstrating it to give you an idea of how it is looking and what its capabilities are. And that'll be exciting as well. All right, thank you all for joining us and we will get the recording posted shortly and we'll see you in the future. Take care everyone.

Robin ([53:55](#)):

This transcript was exported on Jul 29, 2026 - view latest version [here](#).

Thanks everybody.

Guy ([53:56](#)):

Take care. Thank you. Bye-bye.