Subject: Comments on Section 5
From: Van Snyder
References: 02-163, dereference 02-177

1 Introduction

There is nothing here that was in 02-177. The present content was inspired by remarks from the Editor in 02-163. Here's what the Editor had to say:

> The para in 5.1.1.8 about "type-compatable" sure reads strangely for something that is supposed to be a definition of the term. "Even though..." seems like a really strange way to start a definition. I think the problem is that the paragraph presents things in 100% the wrong order. It starts with the strangest case - one strange enough that it feels it needs to introduce if with "Even though". It ends with the most straightforward case. I'd reverse it. First define type-compatable for non-polymporphic entities; that's the obvious, simple one that serves well to introduce the concept. Then define it for polymorphic types. Finally, mention the special case of unlimitted polymorphic. (The last sentence in the para is about entities instead of types; it could stay last).

2 Edits

Edits refer to 02-007r1. 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 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.

75:32-36 A nonpolymorphic entity is **type compatible** only with entities of the same type. A polymorphic entity that is not an unlimited polymorphic entity is type compatible with entities of the same type or any of its extensions. Even though an unlimited polymorphic entity is not considered to have a declared type, it is type compatible with all entities of extensible type. An entity is said to be type compatible with a type if it is type compatible with entities of that type.