

Re: Are "include files" search engine friendly and HTML/XHTML compliant?

## Re: Are "include files" search engine friendly and HTML/XHTML compliant?

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/FrontPage/microsoft.public.frontpage.programming/2006-08/msg00588.html>

---

- *From:* "xfile" <cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 24 Aug 2006 09:23:51 +0800
- 

Hi,

Thanks for all of your inputs, and since many points are similar so I just replied the first one in response to all.

(1) About the doctype: No, I did not mean just by inserting doctype and hope it'd automatically comply with the standard. Did some homework before asked.

(2) About the include file: Yes, it is about the include files. I did the test on the following – If include files are listed, HTML Validator can't even identify doctype and some meta tags, and once include files are removed, it can detect it ok. So it is about the include files.

(3) Other HTML standards: All points are correct. Many of my HTML tags are incorrect not because of ASP pages but because of the tool I used (FP at this point) and lack of correct HTML knowledge of myself – not to blame anything or anyone. I did run test on pages that have removed the major portion of codes and cleaned up many HTML errors.

(4) Finished vs. unprocessed page: It's "finished" product – I guess. I tested on the main template of our site, and by default, the main content area is empty, but it has several include files and some ASP codes to display product categories and other elements. Other static texts or forms or codes will be inserted into the main content area based on the type of pages is needed. In that case, some are unfinished (e.g. user input form) and some will become finished (e.g. confirmation page). Pure processing page are excluded from being modified by this template.

(5) Side question about the table height attribute: According to W3C, XHTML 1.0 Transitional does not support table's " height" attribute so I removed it from one page (just for testing before doing some major errors). It appears no difference, but I am not so sure. I have many tables with height attribute and table is a headache for me. So the question is – Shall I follow the standard and removing all table height attributes or leaving there will produce no harms, if not good?

Continue from (4), I did find, HTML Validator will still give errors for

Re: Are "include files" search engine friendly and HTML/XHTML compliant?

Re: Are "include files" search engine friendly and HTML/XHTML compliant?

left codes such as <%productquantity%> – just an example, it will give error messages, such as Windows runtime error (can't remember correctly) or font attribute error which those fonts are not listed in this page.

I assumed header section has been interpreted correctly, because I could find our site and major pages from Google with our description tag. On the other hand, HTML Validator says the other way.

In any case, my intension of the question is very simple. I am satisfied with our pages but also wish to make it more "compliant" with HTML standard, so they are cleaner and maybe good for search engine and visitors.

In fact, I am just confused by if ASP page is counted as HTML page? If it's not, some errors are fine to be forgotten and I could just use plain page for verification and then insert codes. If it is treated 100% as HTML page, I then have to dig deeper into those codes.

"Jens Peter Karlsen [FP-MVP]" <jpkarlsen@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:uqaoe2t1jrrp58m4ekumh3o4500h367ava@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:uqaoe2t1jrrp58m4ekumh3o4500h367ava@xxxxxxxxxxx)

It will be interpreted correctly if it is written correctly. Just because you insert a doctype tag, doesn't magically make the page compliant with that doctype. If you give us links to one of the asp pages you have problems with, we can give you some pointers on how to make them compliant.

Regards Jens Peter Karlsen. Microsoft MVP – Frontpage.

On Wed, 23 Aug 2006 16:26:46 +0800, "xfile" <cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Hi,

Thanks.

The reason for the question is that when I ran HTML Validator to test some ASP pages, it showed countless errors.

If that's the case, why would we still declare doctype and follow those standards as they can't be interpreted correctly?

"Stefan B Rusynko" <sbr\_enjoy@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eO%23O0voxGHA.2168@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:eO%23O0voxGHA.2168@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Once rendered by the ASP engine all ASP code is just html to the users and Search engines

Re: Are "include files" search engine friendly and HTML/XHTML compliant?

Re: Are "include files" search engine friendly and HTML/XHTML compliant?

– how compliant it is w/ any guidelines depends on how compliant your code wrote your code

--

---

SBR @ ENJOY (-: [ Microsoft MVP – FrontPage ]  
"Warning – Using the F1 Key will not break anything!" (-;  
To find the best Newsgroup for FrontPage support see:  
<http://www.frontpagemvps.com/FrontPageNewsGroups/tabid/53/Default.aspx>

---

"xfile" <cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
<news:elWdFBnxGHA.4336@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

| Hi,

|

| Have a question wish to ask for a long time.

|

| Almost all of our pages are ASP pages and use "include files" and CodePage

| at the very top of the page.

|

| I was wondering, by doing so, are they search engine friendly and do they

| compliant with HTML/XHTML standards?

|

| When using HTML Validator, it gave us so many errors.

|

| Many thanks in advance.

|

|