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The starting point

An Efficiency Comparison of Document Preparation Systems Used in Academic Research and Development

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0115069

This article is based on a debatable method. From a ‘scientific’ point of view, it concludes that Microsoft Word is more efficient than \LaTeX, except for mathematical formulas.

From an ‘extra-scientific’ point of view, it recommends that \TeX\& Cie be no longer supported by state funding.
Some answers... 

... about this method and its conclusion, in French:

https://www.laurentbloch.net/MySpip3/Efficacite-comparee-de-LaTeX-et-de-MS-Word

and in Polish:

http://www.gust.org.pl/bachotex/2015/program#section-64
Going further?

There is no ‘official answer’ from LUG groups. Would such an answer be useful? Or should we ignore this **CENSURED** g article?
My opinion

There were a lot of contributions about WYSIWYG vs WYSIWYM systems in the 1980–1990’s. Useless in this present case.

Microsoft Word has evolved for a decade, but \TeX{} & Cie have, too. InDesign has emerged, but \TeX{} & Cie provide more services. For example, bibliographies according to an author-date style, in footnotes. As another examples, Con\TeX{}t, font management, etc.

*Duration* is important.
And now?

We should be able to emphasise our results, w.r.t. funds.

I am interested in participating in this task. In particular, I can translate Laurent Bloch’s article in English, but:

• I can’t do the whole alone,

• I’m not interested in a religious war, I’m a scientist.