

Evaluation of MkDocs

This page evaluates [Material for MkDocs](#) as a tool for creating documentations. It highlights major advantages and disadvantage to help considering to use it before adopting.

Pros

- Easy setup: [MkDocs](#) is straightforward to install and configure
- [Markdown](#) extensions support: [Material for MkDocs](#) adds many visual elements as theme features
- Extensive plugins: wide range of plugins for PDF export, metadata, etc.

Cons

- Maintenance concerns: [MkDocs](#) is no longer actively maintained, which is a significant red flag
- Core features rely on extensions and plugins: many common features are not built into the core framework and must be added through plugins

Conclusion

[MkDocs](#) can be a good choice for a simple documentation system with a clean appearance and a large plugin ecosystem. It is very practical for a fast setup and flexibility,

At the same time, it is a unmaintained project, so bugs and new features will not be going into this project anytime soon. While there is a [MkDocs 2.0](#) in development, it is not a drop-in replacement for [MkDocs](#). It has no backwards compatibility. It also is not community driven.

In summary, [MkDocs](#) is a strong option for many documentation projects, but has also some bug issues.

For alternatives option of [MkDocs](#), see [Alternatives](#).

 2026-07-09  GitHub 