Subject: Comments on Section 4

From: Van Snyder

References: 02-122, 02-133, e-mail message j3.2002-91

₁ 1 Edits

2	Edits refer to 02-007. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other	
3	instructions, a page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to	
4	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	
5 6	margin, or appear between [and] in the text.	
7	What good does Note 4.1 do? Editor: Delete Note 4.1.]	$31{:}8\!+\!\!\mathrm{ff}$
8	What's the point of "in this standard?" Why so wordy?]	31:20-21
9	The syntax for literal constants of each intrinsic data type is specified in 4.4.	
10	[Editor: "when" \Rightarrow "where".]	33:21
11	[Editor: "this set of" \Rightarrow "the numeric".]	34:3
12 13	[It isn't the <i>digits</i> but the <i>constants</i> that are represented in "their respective number systems" (and it isn't specified what that means).]	35:18-19
14	The binary, octal and hexadecimal constants are interpreted according to their respective num-	
15	ber systems. The hex-digits A through F represent the numbers ten through fifteen, respectively;	
16	they may be represented by their lower-case equivalents.	
17	C408 (R408) A boz-literal-constant shall appear only as a data-stmt-constant in a DATA state-	35:20-22
18	ment, as the actual argument associated with the dummy argument A of the numeric	
19	intrinsic functions DBLE, REAL or INT, or as the actual argument associated with the	
20	X or Y dummy argument of the CMPLX function.	
21 22	(2) as actual arguments to intrinsic procedures other than those for which it is explicitly specified that negative zero is distinguished, and	35:35
23	The paragraph is wrong (one can specify double precision with the REAL keyword), it dupli-	36:1-2
24	cates [36:3-6], and it uses the term "double precision," which hasn't been defined yet. Editor:	
25	"and uses the" \Rightarrow "(R503). The"; Insert "is an alternative specifier for one kind of real	
26	type" at the end of the sentence.]	
27	[Editor: Convert the hyphens in note 4.9 to math-mode minus signs. Put the numbers in math	35:36+ff
28	mode, too; maybe it will improve spacing.]	
29	[Editor: Insert a comma after "example" in the fourth line of note 4.10.]	36:0+
30	[Editor: "one of the following" \Rightarrow "defined as follows".]	38:27
31 32	Sounds like there's a special character set for fixed form. Editor: Move "in fixed source form" to the beginning of the sentence, put a comma and "it is" after it, and adjust capitalization.]	38:28
33 34	[Sounds like there's a special character set for free form. Editor: Move "in free source form" to the beginning of the sentence, put a comma and "it is" after it, and adjust capitalization.]	38:30
35 36	[Editor: After the previous two edits are done, exchange items (1) and (2), to make free form look more important.]	38:28-30

28 February 2002 Page 1 of 4

1	[Editor: Insert a comma before "which".]	40:18
2 3 4 5	[The definition of the properties of sequence type doesn't belong here. Editor: "if \mathbf{type} " \Rightarrow "a storage order is implied for a sequence type (4.5.1.9)"; Move the sentence that begins "The order" to be the second sentence at [52:2], then wrap the "sequence type" that was already there with $tdef$.]	41:13-16
6 7	$\overline{\text{[Paraphrased from 02-133-Editor: "does or"} \Rightarrow \text{contains neither a reference to a specification function nor".]}}$	43:18
8	[Mistakenly allows a generic-name to be the same as the name of a final binding. Editor: "specific" \Rightarrow "nongeneric".]	44:24
10 11 12 13	[From Malcolm's e-mail j3.2002-91:] Default initialization provides a means of automatically initializing pointer components to be disassociated (4.5.1.4), and nonpointer nonallocatable components to have a particular value. Allocatable components are always initialized to not allocated.	47:1+
14	[Editor: Insert "(4.5.3.1)" after "component".]	47:4
15	[Editor: Insert "(5.1.2.5.1)" after "shape".]	48:4
16	[Editor: Insert "explicit-shape" before "array" in the first line of Note 4.28.]	48:bottom
17	[Editor: Insert "nonpointer" before components in the seventh line of Note 4.29.]	49:7+8
18 19	$\overline{\text{[Editor: "If a"} \Rightarrow \text{"A"; "is"} \Rightarrow \text{"that is a } \textit{dtio-generic-spec shall not be"; Delete ", an error condition occurs".]}$	50:6+3-4
20 21	Specify that pointers, per se, aren't finalizable (it's their targets that are). Editor: "An" \Rightarrow "A nonpointer data".]	50:16
22	[Line 9 of Note 4.30: Editor: Delete commas before "X" and after "Y".]	51:19+11
23 24	[Editor: Delete "A derived-type definition" to the end of the note – it has nothing to do with component accessibility, or anything else nearby that subgroup could spot.]	More Note 4.39
25 26 27	[Doesn't cover the case of accessing two different types that have the same name. Also doesn't cover lots of other prohibitions in 16.2, and doesn't add anything to 16.2. Editor: Delete "A unit."]	53:2
28	$\overline{\text{[Editor: "which"} \Rightarrow "that".]}$	53:12
29 30	[Line 1 of Note 4.47 duplicates the normative text two lines above. Editor: Delete "is the name that This".]	54:5+2-3
31 32	[Note 4.49: Leaves out bindings and type parameters. Editor: Insert ", bindings, or parameters" after "components" twice; ", and" \Rightarrow ";".]	55:0+6-7
33 34	$\overline{\text{[Unnecessarily wordy compared to other ones. Editor: Delete "procedure of the" and "that of".]}$	55:11
35	[Editor: Insert a comma after "overriding" in the first line of Note 4.52.]	56:0+2
36	[Editor: Insert "are said to" before "correspond".]	56:9
37	$\overline{\text{[Editor: "when"} \Rightarrow "where".]}$	56:14
38	[Editor: "acording" \Rightarrow "according".]	57:22

28 February 2002 Page 2 of 4

```
[Awkward to say "the type parameters of the type parameters." It's also a bit coy, given that 57:23
   the only type parameter is the kind type parameter. Editor: "agrees ... of" \Rightarrow "of the same
   kind as".]
   [Editor: "actual-arg-spec-list" \Rightarrow "actual-arg-spec-list". Don't include the "-list" part in the 58:2
   indexing. Here's how to do it: "\si{actual-arg-spec}\st{-list}".]
   Intrinsic assignment of derived-type entities is described in 7.5.1. This standard does not specify 59:12-
   any intrinsic operations on derived-type entities.
                                                                                                     Same \P
   [What's nonintrinsic assignment? Editor: "nonintrinsic assignment" \Rightarrow "defined assignment 59:12
   (7.5.1.2)".]
   [Too wordy. Editor: "If ... but" \Rightarrow "Otherwise if".]
                                                                                                     59:18
10
   [Too wordy. Editor: "If ... requirements" ⇒ "Otherwise". It might be argued that this creates
                                                                                                     59:20-21
11
   the classic "dangling else" problem, but the consequent of the first "otherwise if" makes it clear
12
   that anything other than "otherwise applies to the nearest previous if" is nonsense.
   Reads at first as though array components are finalized differently from array objects that 59:22-23
   aren't components. I hope this helps. Editor: Insert "being finalized" after "entity"; "the
1.5
   components ... are" \Rightarrow "each finalizable component of each element of that entity is".]
16
   ["At the same time" and "the order in which they are finalized" are incompatible. Editor: "at 59:26
17
   the same time" \Rightarrow "as a consequence of an event specified in 4.5.10.1".]
   [Editor: "A pointer or" \Rightarrow "The target of a pointer is finalized when the pointer is deallocated. 59:29
   An".]
20
   [Editor: In the first line of Note 4.63, "C" \Rightarrow "The C standard".]
                                                                                                     62:0+7
21
   The asterisk case is covered by a conspiracy of C470 and C540. The colon case, which one 63:25
   might think ought to be covered here if the asterisk case is, is covered by C402. Editor: Delete.
        NOTE 4.71
                                                                                                     64:bottom
        Examples of zero-size array constructors are:
            (/ INTEGER :: /)
            (/(I, I = 1, 0)/)
        NOTE 4.72
        An example of an array constructor that specifies a nonkind type parameter:
            (/ CHARACTER(LEN=7) :: 'Takata', 'Tanaka', 'Hayashi' /)
        In this constructor, without the type specification, it would have been necessary to specify
        all of the constants with the same character length.
   2
        Derived type constructors aren't finished
24
   There is no provision to use a procedure name as a "value" for a procedure pointer component –
25
   a procedure-name is not an instance of an expr. Using expr in R450 covers the data target
26
   syntax, but not the necessary constraints. We add proc-target and data-target – they carry along
27
   constraints C718-C719 and C724-C726. [58:17-59:1] doesn't have the stature of a constraint.
   [Editor: "expr" \Rightarrow "component-data-source".]
                                                                                                     57:29
```

28 February 2002 Page 3 of 4

is

expr

57:29+

 $R450\frac{1}{2}$ component-data-source

1	${f or}$ $data-target$	
2	${f or} proc\text{-}target$	
3	$\overline{\text{C476}\frac{1}{3} \text{ (R450}\frac{1}{2})}$ A data-target shall correspond to a nonprocedure pointer component; a proctarget shall correspond to a procedure pointer component.	58:3+
5	[Rank remapping can't work during construction, so [59:1-2] isn't adequate.]	
6	$C476\frac{2}{3}$ (R450 $\frac{1}{2}$) A data-target shall have the same rank as its corresponding component.	
7	$\overline{[\text{Editor: "}expr" \Rightarrow "component-data-source".]}$	58:4
8	[Editor: Insert "nonallocatable" after "nonpointer".]	58:8
9	[Editor: " $expr$ " \Rightarrow " $component$ - $data$ - $source$ ".]	58:10
10	[Editor: "constructor expression" \Rightarrow "component-data-source".]	58:17
11	[Editor: "object" \Rightarrow "entity".]	59:1

3 Proposed spec change

Revival of pseudo-elementalism. Sometimes you are perfectly happy to have the same finalization done on every element of an array of derived type, but you can't use an elemental procedure because you want to do something forbidden therein, such as I/O.

[Editor: After "argument." insert a new sentence: "Otherwise, if there is a nonelemental final 59:20 subroutine whose dummy argument is a scalar that has the same type and kind type parameters as the entity, it is invoked once for each element of the entity with that element as an actual argument; the elements are finalized in array element order."]

20 4 Question for J3 to ponder

Do we want to specify any accuracy requirements? How about the same as for NEAREST 36:25-26 rounding for I/O at [218:29-31]? Notice that this question applies only to conversion of the textual form of constants to machine numbers, not to arithmetic, and that NEAREST is not the same as IEEE rounding.

28 February 2002