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Nature of the Defect:

I've recently come across some of the lower level measurements and I'm not quite sure how to interpret them. E.g., ST\_Percentage. The specification has this defined as:

22.9.2.9 ST\_Percentage (Percentage Value with Sign) This simple type specifies that its contents will contain a percentage measurement, with a trailing percent sign.

And the regex is defined as "[0-9]+(\.[0-9]+)?%"

But the percent sign appears in fact to be optional: how does this affect the value? For example, a mitre:

<a:miter lim="800000"

xmlns:a="<http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/drawingml/2006/main>" />

Is this the same as:

<a:miter lim="800000%"

xmlns:a="<http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/drawingml/2006/main>" />

i.e., factor 8000?

Should the regex be redefined as "[0-9]+(\.[0-9]+)?%?"

I’ve also come across an anomaly in the Excel implementation: <a:miter lim="10000000"/> is fine but <a:miter lim="10000000%"/> will cause Excel to reject the file.

Implementers notes say that the value should be a 32 bit integer, which would imply a max value of 4294967296 and a regex of "-?[0-9]+?%?" though I expect this value should always be positive.

Solution Proposed by the Submitter:

None

Schema Change(s) Needed:

No

**Editor’s Response:**

**2017-08-17 Makoto Murata:**

29500-1 mandates the use of "%".  If a non-conformant file is given, implementations can do anything.  I believe that MS Word recovers from many errors, and the omission of "%" is one of them.

**2017-08-17 Charlie Clark:**

Thanks for the clarification. The example I use actually comes from an Excel file which validates. Will be useful to hear Microsoft's explanation for this
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