

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/msg00637.html>

---

- *From:* "Murray" <[forums@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:forums@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 26 Aug 2006 08:06:54 -0400
- 

It's right, proper, and correct to make the doctype the first line in the file.

If xfile would show us the pages that are not validating, someone could tell him/her precisely why they are not, instead of vaguely speculating about what might or might not be happening....

—

Murray

-----

MVP FrontPage

"Ronx" <[ronx917@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ronx917@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:OoZpZqOyGHA.1288@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OoZpZqOyGHA.1288@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

I always place the <!doctype> as the first line in the page, everything else follows it.

The pages render correctly in all browsers (that I have checked), and the validators are happy.

Right or wrong? It works, so no worries.

—

Ron Symonds – Microsoft MVP (FrontPage)  
Reply only to group – emails will be deleted unread.  
FrontPage Support: <http://www.frontpagemvps.com/>

"xfile" <[cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:uJEUZfKyGHA.2208@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:uJEUZfKyGHA.2208@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hi,

You are absolutely correct that I did not understand most of things I were told here.

Although I think I understood your points from 1–6, I don't really understand 7, 8 and what Murray meant "incorrect".

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

But I guess it's not important, and I can simply live with something I don't really understand since there are too many.

But just to share, I did try with a blank page produced by EWD and tested it only with included files and not with it.

Nothing else were included and that's how I derived the conclusion. I don't know what kind of mistakes could I possibly make under that test.

But again, as long as the rest of HTML codes are compliant with the standard and when ASP include files and codes are being added can do the job – I am more than happy to care for why HTML Validator produce errors when those two are combined.

Many thank for all of your kind sharing!

Again, I don't know in that case, what mistakes could I possibly make?  
"Kevin Spencer" <uce@xxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:euyKUNEyGHA.4972@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:euyKUNEyGHA.4972@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Final note – Although I don't know the "scientific" reasons for this, I am almost certain that these so-called HTML Validators are not very friendly with include files (or CodePage). I guess it's because include files and doctype tag are fighting with each other for the top position on the page, and HTML Validator tends to favor doctype tag better. Once include files are removed, it can correctly ID doctype tag and others. Once include files are placed on the top position, it even told me that I should not put doctype tag at that position (or "instance" in its own word) which is right below the include files.

This is because you did not understand what you were told:

1. HTML is text. You can create HTML with NotePad.
2. ASP is a technology that dynamically generates HTML (text)
3. An include file is simply a separate file that is inserted into another and returned as part of the other file. The files are combined into a single file and processed as if they were one file.
4. The include file is exactly like any other ASP page in

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

every other  
respect.

5. ASP coding does not go to the browser, only the HTML that it generates.
6. You create the ASP pages and server-side includes.
7. Therefore, you decide what HTML it will produce.
8. Therefore, if the HTML doesn't validate, it is your doing.

--  
HTH,

Kevin Spencer  
Microsoft MVP  
Chicken Salad Surgery

It takes a tough man to make a tender chicken salad.

"xfile" <cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:OCUf1UByGHA.2516@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OCUf1UByGHA.2516@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hi,

Actually, that is the one I used when I was at  
W3C researching the  
differences between different doctypes and  
HTML standards.

And the test was against the page residing in  
the server. I apologize  
though for not providing pages or site name.  
I just don't feel  
comfortable for providing site name on the  
net.

In any case, I have done the test by  
removing all ASP codes and have it  
tested against only HTML contents and also  
done the corrections.

Just for reference:

No.1 error: No closing tag – I did not know  
that and my best friend FP  
did not do it for me or remind me.

No 2 error: No alt attribute for image files –  
Well, purely my fault –  
too lazy for doing it for all images.

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

Final note – Although I don't know the "scientific" reasons for this, I am almost certain that these so-called HTML Validators are not very friendly with include files (or CodePage).

I guess it's because include files and doctype tag are fighting with each other for the top position on the page, and HTML Validator tends to favor doctype tag better. Once include files are removed, it can correctly ID doctype tag and others. Once include files are placed on the top position, it even told me that I should not put doctype tag at that position (or "instance" in its own word) which is right below the include files.

In any case, I found Expression Web Developer will add those closing tags and hopefully it will do so for other elements as well.

Thanks for your kind advise.

"Jens Peter Karlsen [FP-MVP]"  
<jpkarlsen@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:g0nqe2haa4mcmd86fjaujvrm6t8v19928s@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:g0nqe2haa4mcmd86fjaujvrm6t8v19928s@xxxxxxxxxxx)

It sounds to me like the html validator you talk about is a local tool which you use to open the asp file directly from your harddrive? If so that will never work. You must go thru the Server so it sees the generated html not the raw asp code. try W3Cs validator at: <http://validator.w3.org/> Point it to the URL of your \*.asp page and see what it says.

Since you seem unwilling to post an URL here, we can't

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

help you any  
further.

Regards Jens Peter Karlsen.  
Microsoft MVP –  
Frontpage.

On Thu, 24 Aug 2006  
09:23:51 +0800, "xfile"  
<cou-cou@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

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

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

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  
intention 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

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

page  
for  
verification  
and then  
insert codes.  
If it is  
treated  
100% as  
HTML  
page,  
I then have  
to dig  
deeper into  
those codes.