

TeX (Live) and accessibility at arXiv

Norbert Preining

Abstract

This article combines two talks at the TUG 2024 conference, one about TeX (Live) at arXiv, and one about accessibility and HTML papers. We will give a short introduction of what arXiv is and its importance for open science. After this introduction, the first part deals with how we use TeX at arXiv, followed by a second part on improving accessibility at arXiv.

1 Introduction

arXiv is the world’s largest and oldest scientific preprint server, and a champion of open science. Started in 1991, arXiv presently holds more than 2.4 million articles and is growing at an ever-increasing rate.

In many areas of physics, math, and computer science, cutting edge research is first made available on arXiv. Examples are

- LLM research (OpenAI, Deepmind, etc.)
- LIGO (Gravity wave research; 2017 Nobel Prize in physics)
- Proofs of famous theorems (Grigori Perelman)

And while most papers posted to arXiv are eventually published in journals, in some fields research is often made available only on arXiv. Even for work subsequently published in journals, early posting to arXiv enables scientists to more rapidly incorporate shared results, and assert prior authorship.

What sets arXiv apart from many other services is *openness*: All articles are freely available without any paywall, and in addition, for more than 90% of the articles, sources are available — big thanks to Paul Ginsparg et al. for insisting from the start in 1991 that scientists submit the source code for their papers!




Figure 1: arXiv monthly submissions, 1991–present

arXiv also profits from and contributes to open source software: Our fundamental tools include TeX, nowadays TeX Live, and L^ATeXML for the conversion to HTML. Both are open source projects, and we are in very close contact with both maintainer teams.

2 TeX at arXiv

About 90% of submissions are in L^ATeX, going back more than 30 years. For the submissions where we have TeX source, we consider the PDF artifacts as generated and it is sometimes necessary to recreate them. Consequences of this approach is that we have to keep One consequence of this approach is that we have to keep old versions of TeX available to ensure compilability even of documents from the start of arXiv. This means that, as of now we are having available (and regularly use for PDF rebuilds) the following TeX installations:

- teTeX 2 and 3
- TeX Live: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2020, 2023

In particular teTeX 2 has put me in front of a few challenges, since the first teTeX 1 (ab)used heavily when I started maintaining TeX in Debian was teTeX 3, which has a very different configuration approach than teTeX 2.

2.1 AutoTeX

Up to now, the system that accepts a submission, and converts it to a PDF, is a Perl program called AutoTeX [6], written at arXiv. It has been maintained since the beginning of arXiv, but hasn’t changed a lot since then. Its main jobs are detecting the format of the submission (plain TeX or L^ATeX) by running respective engines and accepting the first one that succeeds in compiling the submission. This already can lead to strange cases where a file that is not the intended top level document is nevertheless considered as such and compiled using plain TeX, despite being a L^ATeX document.

AutoTeX supports only two formats: L^ATeX with dvips/ps2pdf or with pdf_latex, and plain TeX with dvips/ps2pdf route. For L^ATeX calls, AutoTeX reruns several times until references are stable. For plain TeX files only one run is executed.

In the end, all generated and additional PDF files are combined into a final PDF using pdfpages.

There are several shortcomings with this approach:

- No support for LuaTeX or XeTeX or any other engine
- No support for BIBTeX or biber/BIBL^ATeX; bbl files must be uploaded
- No support for makeindex

- Merging with pdfpages breaks hyperlinks in documents
- Detection of main document is often incorrect (conference templates are often uploaded together with actual paper)
- arXiv watermarking is fragile
- ... (probably so many other problems I'm not remembering or haven't seen yet)

2.2 The (very near) future

arXiv is currently in a complete restructuring process, modernizing practically all parts of the system, and moving core parts to a cloud-based system.

The new TeX backend system will be based on a dockerized TeX to PDF conversion system, which allows for a certain restricted set of parameters (usage of additional trees, watermarking, etc.). Older systems (which we have to keep available to re-compile older submissions) will be dockerized together with AutoTeX. The system will contain an auto-dispatch component to the respective TeX Live year container depending on submission date.

Advantages we get from leaving AutoTeX behind and rewriting include, first and foremost, *less magic* — getting rid of the *auto* part of AutoTeX and replacing it with clear indications by the submitter which file should be compiled with which engine. The frontend submission workflow will see considerable changes in the very near future, too.

Another great advantage of the new system will be the possibility to build *reproducible documents* [5] — that is, documents that can be bitwise compared after changes of system components.

Further improvements include better watermarking (by switching to the `pymupdf` library for watermarking), and better PDF composition (using `gs` which preserves hyperlinks; see [3] for a related discussion).

We also will stop providing additional class and style files, which many users have relied on in the past. Going forward, we expect submissions to contain class files for journals that are not provided by TeX Live itself. The problem is with class and style files distributed by certain journals that have restrictions in place making it impossible to include them in TeX Live. At arXiv, we have provided the latest version of these class files for many years, but the proliferation of more and more non-TL files, and the management of versions of those files, has created a considerable burden at arXiv.

We have thus decided that going forward, only files distributed by TeX Live itself will be automatically available, and all other files need to be included in the submission.

2.3 The (hopefully near) future

With the basic rewrite already done, we are now aiming at including long requested features in the (hopefully) near future. At the top of that list is an improvement for the submission process itself, making it easy and painless for *easy* submissions, but still giving the user full freedom to submit a complicated arrangement within a submission.

Also very high up on our list is support for LuaTeX and XeTeX, as well as for bibliographies and indices (no need to ship pre-made `.bb1` files!).

Also in the pipeline is publishing our TeX to PDF docker web API service as open source.

3 Accessibility at arXiv

This is an abridged version of an article at the DEIMS 2024 conference [4]. The authors of the DEIMS paper and the full arXiv team are responsible for all the achievements, I am only reporting on the current status!

arXiv has a mandate to continuously improve access to scientific research, and our long-term mission is simply to serve the needs of the scientific community through openness, collaboration and scholarship. Everyone has the right to participate in the wealth of scientific knowledge contributed to arXiv by researchers from all over the world. Accessibility is inherent to our mission of championing open science. When we asked scientists with disabilities how arXiv could help make research more accessible they told us: add HTML as a format for papers.

Over the past few years, arXiv has made good progress in making our website [2] more accessible according to W3C WAI guidelines. While this allows people with disabilities to more easily find and access papers, they often cannot read them because arXiv's papers are available almost exclusively in PDF format, which has low native accessibility.

What we heard from scientists with disabilities, standards experts, and accessibility researchers is that PDF will always be playing catch up with HTML when it comes to accessibility. Adding HTML as a format on arXiv will get us closer to fulfilling the promise of open science.

3.1 PDF limitations wrt accessibility

PDF has been designed as a *page description* language, representing the physical page to be printed. It is an excellent format for this purpose, but the internal representation poses a lot of problems when it comes to accessibility.

Page and reflow paper geometry and the actual screen dimensions are different in most of the cases,

and zooming in often requires horizontal scrolling. Although there are moves by Adobe to provide some kind of responsive design, i.e. “Liquid Mode”, this is mobile-only and proprietary.

Structural limitations When a page is described in PDF, lots of semantic information is lost (at least until PDF/UA2): headers, captions, all semantic entities are reduced to purely typographic elements. While “Tagged PDF”, introduced by Adobe, aims at improving the situation, most documents out now are not properly tagged, and there is very poor support for the creation of tagged PDFs.

Recent developments on the \LaTeX kernel side show promising advances, but it cannot deliver now a solution to the scale of the arXiv corpus, since documents still require manual work to achieve proper tagging.

3.2 HTML is a better solution

HTML already provides now what most of the PDF and PDF/UA2 is trying to deliver in the future: responsive design, dark mode, built-in language translations, add-ins for, e.g. dyslexia or visually impaired, all backed by a rich marketplace of assistive technologies.

The HTML code also preserves the semantic structure and intent of the document, allowing for better representation in e.g. screen readers.

Last but not least, text harvesting, e.g. for LLM, is easier when based on HTML, while text extraction based on PDF can get rather tricky.

But there are stumbling blocks: online scientific work is mostly available only in PDF format, and conversion from PDF to HTML is challenging, in spite of some interesting work that `allen.ai` has done in this area [1], because structure, once lost, is difficult to reconstruct.

3.3 Converting \LaTeX to HTML

Since more than 90% of the arXiv’s submissions are in \TeX , and lately mostly in \LaTeX , it is natural to consider direct \LaTeX to HTML conversions. Since \TeX itself also produces typographic information where all structure is lost, relying directly on the \TeX engine to provide HTML output is non-trivial. Thus, all available converters basically operate in the same way, namely providing XML/SGML/HTML renderings for each and every command available. With \TeX 4ht, \TeX itself is used, while \LaTeX ML uses Perl. For all systems it remains an immense project to provide XML renderings for each command defined in each add-on package in the \TeX and \LaTeX landscape. Thus, all of the solutions will remain partial for the foreseeable future.

The main solutions currently available are \LaTeX ML maintained by Bruce Miller and Deyan Ginev at NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology)

\TeX 4ht created by Eitan M. Gurari, now maintained by Michal Hoftich

\LaTeX support for tagged PDF: \LaTeX core team, early stage

arXiv took a pragmatic approach and investigated the existing tools. \TeX 4ht and \LaTeX ML were roughly tied in the quality of the HTML produced, but \LaTeX ML was found to have a larger library of supported packages and better ongoing support. Beyond that, the predecessor project *ar5iv* already used \LaTeX ML.

The *ar5iv project* was started by Dr. Michael Kohlhase from KWARC and Ph.D. student Deyan Ginev. Its intent was to offer HTML versions for arXiv’s entire \LaTeX corpus, using \LaTeX ML. It had about 20% failed conversions, as well as other visual glitches, but saw significant improvements over the years. Unfortunately, reconversion of old articles is a costly endeavor; on Google Cloud with an approximate average cost of \$0.015 per article, it would amount to approximately \$30,000 for the entire arXiv corpus.

Further pain points we face with the \LaTeX ML conversion is the already mentioned long tail of less common packages that are not supported, as well as author-written macros and extensions (here \TeX 4ht has the advantage of using \TeX itself for macro expansion). Furthermore, there will always remain some edge cases where \LaTeX constructs don’t render correctly.

Despite all the abovementioned shortcomings, providing HTML pages — even with glitches — has proven a resounding success with the accessibility community, because even in the presence of those glitches, the papers remain generally readable, in particular for screen readers. To put it in simple words:

Something is better than nothing!

3.4 Rollout and user interface

An HTML version of arXiv’s corpus has been available for several years now in the ar5iv project, but it remains less known (compared to arXiv itself). Thus, bringing the ar5iv project “in house” and providing the HTML versions directly alongside the PDF version made the change much more visible and profound.

In addition to the delivery of the HTML version, we have already included the HTML generation into the submission process, asking authors to review




Figure 2: Article view with HTML entry

the HTML version in addition to the PDF version. While a failed generation of the PDF version blocks further processing, we do not consider a failed HTML conversion as a blocker. We do hope that authors will review the HTML rendering and consider making adjustments to their \LaTeX source to improve the HTML version.

The HTML versions also prominently feature a feedback button that allows users to indicate incorrect renderings and other problems with the conversions. With millions of users performing QA on our HTML — we already have seen thousands of reports — we feel we can improve the conversion process in the future.

In the article view on arXiv (fig. 2), we have added an additional format entry, as well as a “Beta” label. As of now, the HTML format button will only be shown with new submissions until we backfill the historical corpus over time.

When visiting the HTML version of a paper (fig. 3), and if the \LaTeX conversion issued warnings, these warnings are shown in a separate panel at the top. This will often be the case for packages used in the \LaTeX code that are not supported at present. In the screenshot we see the \LaTeX package `inconsolata` not being supported.

The next screenshot (fig. 4) shows that formulas and tables are supported, included graphics are shown as is, and that a dark mode setting in the browser is taken into account. Mind also the prominent “Report issue” button (lower right corner)!

3.5 Future work and summary

Making our corpus accessible is an open-ended project, and we are aware of the shortcomings our current solutions have, but we are also aware of the profound positive impact the addition of HTML versions has already had in the accessibility community.




Figure 3: HTML version view with warning panel




Figure 4: HTML version view with math and report issue button

To pick a few items from the long list of future work:

- Continue to work with the \LaTeX team to improve conversion process
- Figure out a cost-effective way to periodically re-compile the whole corpus to pick up these improvements
- Revisit tooling in a few years when the \LaTeX team is further along — we are hopeful that the work to produce tagged PDFs will also enable the generation of HTML output
- Make charts and graphs more accessible

- Possibly provide a way for users to access the data behind graphs
- Auto-caption images and graphs, via AI or crowd sourcing or both.

To summarize, we want to stress that accessibility of scientific documents is an important improvement, and the feedback from the community and disabled scientists has been overwhelmingly positive—HTML even with glitches is better than PDF! And while we are still far from “the last mile”, we are making great progress thanks to a great community and open source support.

3.6 Acknowledgments

We thank the many scientists with disabilities who so generously shared their expertise, insights, and feedback, and guided arXiv’s efforts towards impact.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. OAC-2311521. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Big thanks to the whole arXiv team—I have only recently joined and am reporting on **their** achievements!

References

- [1] Allen Institute for AI. Paper to HTML. papertohtml.org/
- [2] arXiv project. arxiv.org
- [3] K. Berry. Production notes. *TUGboat* 45(1):154–154, 2024. doi.org/10.47397/tb/45-1/tb139prod
- [4] C. Frankston, J. Godfrey, et al. HTML papers on arXiv—why it is important, and how we made it happen, 2024. arxiv.org/abs/2402.08954
- [5] Reproducible builds website. reproducible-builds.org
- [6] T. Schwander. AutoTeX on CPAN. metacpan.org/pod/TeX::AutoTeX

◇ Norbert Preining
arXiv / Cornell University
`norbert (at) arxiv dot org`
<https://arxiv.org/>