JOR Response to 01-357r1 - Comments on Section 9

To: J3
From: Craig Dedo
Date: December 4, 2001
Subject: JOR Response to 01-357r1 - Comments on Section 9

JOR reviewed the recommendations in 01-357r1 and recommends as follows. References are to 01-007r4.

1 Edits

[170:25] Yes. This is fixed in 01-007r4.

[194:30] Yes. Delete the extraneous period (".") between "available" and "in a".

[207:19] No. We use this construct in similar circumstances in several other places, most notably in 9.9.3 and 9.9.5.

2 Combine Sections 9.5.3 and 9.9

This is a complex issue. Postpone until later.

3 Miscellaneous

[171:13] Delete "permanently".

[197:12+] Add the following sentence as a new paragraph:
An EOR= specifier may appear only in an input statement that contains an ADVANCE= specifier with the value NO.

[182:3-5] Do nothing.

[186:29-31] Wait until JOR decides what to do about the recommendations in section 2.

[200:3-4] No. The answer to this question is at the beginning of section 9.8.1.

[208:18, 21] Change " *variable* " to "*do-variable* " in two places.

4 MTE Proposal

JOR decided for a variety of reasons that it is best to leave the rules about backspacing over records as they are. In practice, most Fortran compilers will allow the program to backspace over records written using list-directed or namelist formatting since there is no way to tell if a particular record in a file was written using either of these methods or regular format expressions.

References

01-007r4, Fortran 2000 Draft

[End of J3 / 01-389]