Next Generation Input Methods

Presented by Daiki Ueno, Anish Patil

Today's Topics

I. UX of Future Input Methods by Anish

ibus-typing-booster developer

II.Architecture of Future Input Methods by Daiki

IBus and Japanese engine developer

I. User Experience

Auto completion

- Need?
- Projects?

Problems?

- Candidate lists
- Good Dictionaries
- Uniform Experience

Solutions

- Tab completion
- Delay while showing suggestions
- Show suggestions inline
- Show suggestions on fixed length bar and select candidates using numbers

Dictionaries

- Users
- Use cases?

Issues?

- Words are not updated frequently
- Incorrect words in dictionaries
- No unique upstream
- Analysis on present stage

Demo

http://webwordedit-wwe.rhcloud.com/

II. Architecture

Yet another IM architecture?

- Are you creating an IBus alternative?
 NO!
- This is a renovation project
- What's wrong with the IBus architecture?

Traditional IM architecture



Traditional IM architecture

Almost all components run in a single process

- Pros
 - Fast response
- Cons
 - One engine can make the whole system unusable
 - Some engines are very complex by nature and can be irresponsive on high resource usage

IBus architecture



IBus architecture

- Every component run as a separate process
- Pros
 - Crash resistant
 - Stable frontend (panel) API, based on D-Bus
- Cons
 - Slow response IPC costs
 - Complicated implementation

IBus implementation issues

- Slow switching of engines
 - The backend API is not fully asynchronous nor cancellable
- Process management glitches
 - No mechanism to recover crashed engine
 - Newly installed engines are not recognized until ibus-daemon restarts
- Small number of test cases
 - ~30% code coverage

Our approach

- Separate out <u>unstable components</u> only

 Complex engines like Pinyin and Kana Kanji

 Provide the IM architecture itself as a library

 gnome-shell can directly use it with the same
 - API as IBus, through gobject-introspection,

Hybrid architecture



Hybrid architecture

- Only unstable components run separately
- Pros
 - Crash resistant
 - Fast response from simple engines
 - Stable frontend API, through gobject-introspection
- Cons
 - Even more complicated implementation
 - But we can do better, using the recent inventions gdbus-codegen, GCancellable, GTask,

Prototype: libtextinput

- Claim invocation type in the XML description
 - In-process or out-process
- Automatic crash recovery
- Demo client as a Wayland input-method
- Reuse IBus engines as a shared library (WIP)

Summary

- IBus frontend API is stable and good, however...
- The architecture needs renovation
 - Fully asynchronous backend API
 - Smarter process management
 - Reduced IPC costs
 - More tests

Questions?