

# BoF Session: What Is to Be Done?

Jean-Michel HUFFLEN

FEMTO-ST/DISC — University of Bourgogne Franche-Comté

BachTeX, 1st May 2019

# 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  $\text{\LaTeX}$ , except for mathematical formulas.■

From an 'extra-scientific' point of view, it recommends that  $\text{\TeX}$  & Cie be no longer supported by state funding.

## Some answers. . .

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

[https://www.laurentbloch.net/MySip3/  
Efficacite-comparee-de-LaTeX-et-de-MS-Word](https://www.laurentbloch.net/MySip3/Efficacite-comparee-de-LaTeX-et-de-MS-Word)

and in Polish:

[http://www.gust.org.pl/bachotex/2015/  
program#section-64](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 for **\*\*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 T<sub>E</sub>X & Cie have, too. InDesign has emerged, but T<sub>E</sub>X & Cie provide more services. For example, bibliographies according to an author-date style, in footnotes. As another examples, ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt, 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.