Subject: Comments on Section 1, Unresolved issue 340
From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

Edits refer to 02-007. 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 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.

[Same scoping unit as what? Editor: Delete "same".] 2:40

[The term "noted" sounds nonnormative. Editor: "noted" ⇒ "identified". Question for the editor: Is it OK to say "this section" or should "this section" be "1.6.1" (which doesn't have a label, so you would need to add `\divn`)?] 3:11

[Editor: Delete the commas and parenthesize "informally ... 77", so that the "(Fortran 90)" and "(Fortran 95)" in subsequent subclauses will have a similar style. I don't think we need to get worked up about the elliptic "informally known as" in those subclauses.] 3:12

[1.6.3 uses a numbered list. Editor: For consistency, add "The following Fortran 95 features may have different interpretations in this standard:" at [3:13] and make the paragraphs that begin at lines 14, 18 and 21 separate items in a numbered list.] 3:13-22

[So as not to argue whether to use "different than" or "different from" – Editor: Delete "than Fortran 95".] 3:21

[The term "noted" sounds nonnormative. Editor: second "noted" ⇒ "identified". (The first use of "noted" is OK because it refers to an Annex.) Question for the editor: Is it OK to say "this section" or should "this section" be "1.6.2"?] 3:24

[The term "noted" sounds nonnormative. Editor: second "noted" ⇒ "identified". (The first use of "noted" is OK because it refers to an Annex.) Question for the editor: Is it OK to say "this section" or should "this section" be "1.6.3"?] 4:2

[There are now differences additional to specifying behavior that was not specified in FORTRAN 77. Editor: Insert "and that does not depend on the differences specified here" before "remains".] 4:4

[Using "required" twice is awkward. Editor: First "required" ⇒ "identified". Sentence is already in past tense. Editor: Delete "was to".] 4:17

[Shading sometimes doesn't work. It probably will be present in the final printed ISO version. But just to be precise, and to repair a run-on sentence, Editor: "identified ... nonnormative" ⇒ "nonnormative; it is identified by being in a shaded, framed box that has a numbered heading beginning with the word NOTE.] 4:37

[Editor: Delete "are used to" because it's just noise. There's no "help" about the syntax rules. They are *the* description of all but three of the syntax forms. Editor: Delete "help".] 4:39

[Remark to the editor: See how it looks if you convert the `longtable` to an `nbdesc` environment. This should also get line numbers turned on. 5:2+

[Editor: "which" ⇒ "that".] 5:2+5 lines

[The constraints have not yet been discussed. Using "the" implies that they have. Editor: Delete "the".]	5:11
[Editor: last three lines of *digit-string* examples should also be indented.]	5:11+6-8
[Editor: "When" ⇒ "If".]	5:11+9
[Editor: Indent.]	5:11+10-13
[Editor: "When" ⇒ "Where".]	6:23
[It's the descriptions of obsolescent features, not the features, to which "Obsolescent ... size" applies. Editor: "Obsolescent ... distinguishing" ⇒ "The descriptions of obsolescent features appear in a smaller".]	6:31-32
[Editor: Delete "should" because it is redundant to "recommended".]	7:6
[It doesn't make sense to speak in the past tense about possible future events. Editor: "has become" ⇒ "becomes". The use of these features is already insignificant in all contexts other than Fortran programs. Editor: Delete "in Fortran programs".]	7:10
[The advice shouldn't be restricted to the committee that develops the next revision. Editor: Delete "from the next revision".]	7:11
[Question for the editor: Should "Standard ... arithmetic" be set in italic face?]	7:32

2 Unresolved issue 340

Issue 340 reads:

If the relevant interpretations pass the Corrigendum, we need to move the PAD= paragraph from above to here and add a similar paragraph for the MOD function.

Interpretation 87 (MOD and MODULO intrinsic functions with zero divisor) and interpretation 92 (Values of the PAD= Specifier in the INQUIRE Statement) have been included in Technical Corrigendum 2. The edits of these interpretations include text meant for the compatibility section. These edits are reproduced below.

[Editor: Remove.]	3:18-20
The PAD= specifier in the INQUIRE statement in this standard returns the value UNDEFINED if there is no connection or the connection is for unformatted input/output. Fortran 90 specified YES.	3:26+

Fortran 90 specified that if the second argument to MOD or MODULO was zero, the result was processor dependent. This standard specifies that the second argument shall not be zero.