Subject: Comments on Section 10
From: Van Snyder

# 1 Edits

Edits refer to 07-007r3. 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 immediately following text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that immediately following text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [ and ] in the text.

| | |
|---|---|
| [Editor: Remove the quotes around "round to nearest". None of the other IEEE rounding modes have quotes here.] | 217:21 |

# 2 Don't know what to do

| | |
|---|---|
| Is the term "constant" defined for the external representation of numbers? | 213:28 |
| Editor: The font for $z$ is italic here but it's math font in the table at [212:13-20]. We probably need not do anything. The same font is used for both instances in 01-007r4. | 212:21 |
| We can write newlines by specifying ACHAR(10), but we can't read newlines at all. Is that asymmetry intended? E.g., should record boundary become ACHAR(10) on input? If not, why do we bother with the convenience of ACHAR(10) for output, given that a "/" edit descriptor suffices? | 218:23+ |
| If there is no such record, how can it become the current record? It seems OK to call a record that doesn't exist the current record if you're getting ready to write it. We already say "thou shalt not read the record if it doesn't exist"? | 221:14-15 |
| It would seem that PROCESSOR_DEFINED rounding could also be allowed to do what's specified here (but of course we shouldn't require it). | 222:13-17 |
| Subclause 10.9 needs an introduction. | 223:9+ |
| Subclause 10.10 needs an introduction. | 226:41+ |

# 3 Plea for an MTE

The requirement 207:19-20

C1002 (R1002) The comma used to separate *format-item*s in a *format-item-list* may be omitted

(1) Between a P edit descriptor and an immediately following F, E, EN, ES, D, or G edit descriptor (10.7.5),

but not if there's a repeat specification, is an incompatibility with the 1966 standard that crept into FORTRAN 77 (compare page 19 of the 1966 standard to [13-2:26-30] of the FORTRAN 77 standard.)

Can we go back to allowing the comma to be omitted even if there's a repeat specification?