22 April 2007 J3/07-189

Subject: Comments on Clause 6

From: Van Snyder

1 1 Edits

Edits refer to 07-007r1. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other instructions, a page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to be replaced by associated 3 text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that associated text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text. 5 Editor: Needs an ISO-mandated subclause heading. 119:1+The first three sentences of the paragraph duplicate [20:1-3]. Editor: Delete "A constant ... (5.3.12, 7 120:1-3 5.4.10)." Then add (2.4.3.1.2) after "constant".] 8 [Duplicates [22:19]. Editor: Delete the paragraph. 120:24 9 According to C406, an object of abstract declared type cannot be other than polymorphic, so C612 121:1 10 does nothing. Editor: Delete C612.] 11 [Editor: Exchange "neither" and "be".] 121:23 Editor: Needs an ISO-mandated subclause heading. 123:1+[Duplicates [96:13-14]. Editor: Delete "An assumed . . . shape.] 123:10-11 [Editor: Replace "that" by "its".] 124:715 [Editor: Continuation of Table 6.1 needs a heading.] 125:0+16 The many-one array section restriction is needlessly complicated by singling out only the two possible 126:4-7 17 cases of its appearance in a variable definition context. It would be simpler to say "variable definition 18 context." The subclause would be clearer if this material were after material on the more general case. 19 20 Editor: Move "A many-one ... statement" to be a new paragraph at [126:10+]. Then replace "appear ... statement" by "not appear in a variable-definition context (16.6.7)".] 21 [Paragraph is duplicative and overly complex. If we must keep it, replace it:] 126:8-10 22 An array section with a vector subscript shall not be argument associated with a dummy argument 23 that is defined or redefined (12.5.2.5(18)), the target in a pointer assignment (C726), or an internal file (C901).25 [Editor: Needs an ISO-mandated subclause heading.] 127:8+26 [Editor: Replace "a type-spec" by "type-spec" thrice.] 128:1,3,5 27 [Of all the paragraphs in 6.3.1, only three begin "When an ALLOCATE statement is executed..." even 129:14,19,130:3 28 though most of the paragraphs are about what happens when an ALLOCATE statement is executed. 29 Editor: Replace "When ... which" by "When" at [129:14], replace "When ... co-array, the" by "The", 30 and replace "When ... allocate-shape-spec-list" by "If allocate-shape-spec-list does not appear".] The term "with this status" could more clearly be "allocated" or "unallocated". A list isn't really 130:130 32 needed. Paragraph (2) of the subclause could reasonably be combined into the second list item. Editor: 33 Delete [130:17]. Convert the itemized list into ordinary paragraphs. Insert "allocation" before "status" at [130:18]. Replace "if" by "when" thrice at [130:18-19] because [130:18] says "becomes". Replace 35 "allocatable variable with this status" by "allocated allocatable variable" at [130:20]. Replace "a status" by "an allocation status" at [130:23]. Insert ".1" after "6.3.3" at [130:24] because it's more precise. 37 Replace "if" by "when" twice at [130:24]. Replace "allocatable variable with this status" by "unallocated 38 allocatable variable" at [130:25]. Move the paragraph at [130:30] to be a sentence before "The status" 39 at [130:23].]

22 April 2007 Page 1 of 2

22 April 2007 J3/07-189

41	[Editor: Delete "An unsaved unallocated." since that's covered by [130:30].]	130:35-36
42	[Editor: Insert "The" before "stat-variable".]	133:18
43	[Editor: Replace the semicolon by a comma, or re-word the sentence not to use "nor".]	133:19
44	[Editor: Insert "The" before "errmsg-variable".]	134:4
45	[Editor: Replace the semicolon by a comma, or re-word the sentence not to use "nor".]	134:5
46	2 Questions and comments without edits	
47	What is the point of C616?	121:7
48	$\overline{\mbox{I couldn't find normative support for the first paragraph. If it exists, it would be helpful to reference it.}$	128: Note 6.17
49 50	It's not prohibited to allocate a co-array that has co-rank > 1 with the product of the extents specified by the <i>allocate-co-shape-specs</i> greater than the number of images. What happens in that case?	6.3.1
51 52 53 54	This paragraph refers to the actual argument associated with an INTENT(OUT) dummy argument. The discussion of finalization at [75:35-36] refers to the actual argument associated with an INTENT(OUT) dummy argument. The discussion of INTENT(OUT) at [98:15-20] refers only to the dummy argument. Should these be consistent? If so, which way?	132:22-24

22 April 2007 Page 2 of 2