Subject: Comments on Annex C
From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

Edits refer to 01-007r3. 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: "a" ⇒ "the".]	405:22
[It isn't true that the "descriptors" are "fixed" for nonpointer entities. Dummy arguments, automatic variables, and allocatable variables all have non-fixed properties that are claimed to be represented in the hypothetical descriptor. Editor: Delete "by its declaration".]	405:25-26
[Editor: Set in ordinary non-code font. OK in LaTeX.]	408:7
[Editor: Insert "deallocates the space that is associated with both PA and PB. PB becomes disassociated, but there is no requirement that the processor make it explicitly recognizable that PA no longer has a target. This" before "leaves".	412:38
[Editor: Delete "given".]	413:4
[Editor: Insert "or associated with a different target" after "nullified".]	413:5
[Editor: Delete "In ... dereferenced." The substance of this sentence is already said twice in the paragraph. There's no need to say it a third time.]	413:22-23
The subclause heading for C.5.2 is missing from 01-007r4.	415:28
[Editor: "Additional examples" ⇒ "Examples", because there aren't any other examples of DO constructs in Annex C.]	415:32
[Editor: Some would quibble whether "out" ought to be "in". The best solution is to delete "out".]	418:12
It is not necessary for all requests to be tracked by the runtime library. If an ID= specifier does not appear in a READ or WRITE statement, the runtime is free to forget about this	420:41-42
[Editor: "which" ⇒ "that".]	421:9
[Editor: "info" ⇒ "information".]	421:25
[Incomplete, and obsolete terminology – we use "modes" instead of "specifiers" now, and there are several missing. Editor: "BLANK= ... specifiers" ⇒ "blank interpretation mode, decimal edit mode, pad mode, I/O rounding mode, delimiter mode, and sign mode.	421:46-47
[Editor: "which" ⇒ "that".]	424:30
An additional benefit of using the ONLY specifier is that the identifier of every accessed entity is explicitly present in each program unit. This means that one need not search other program units to find where each one is defined. This reduces maintenance costs.	425:43+ New ¶
[Editor: "which" ⇒ "that".]	426:30
[Editor: "on" ⇒ "about".]	426:32

[Doesn't account for procedure declaration statements. Editor: Insert "explicitly" before "declaring" and "in ... body" ⇒ "to have the EXTERNAL attribute (5.1.2.6)".	431:41
[Doesn't account for procedure declaration statements. Editor: "in an ... body" ⇒ "of the "EXTERNAL attribute".]	432:1-2
[The phrase "have been added to" was useful to draw the distinction between FORTRAN 77 and Fortran 90 – two standards ago. It's an anachronism now. Editor: Delete it.]	433:11-12
[Editor: "which" ⇒ "that" twice.]	433:15-16
[The whole annex is a note! Editor: "Note that while" ⇒ "While".]	433:24
[The sentences "Alternatively ... processor" appear to contradict the normative parts of the standard. Editor: Delete them, just to be safe – they don't contribute much, even if they're legal.]	433:30-33
[Editor: Insert "some" before "allocatable".]	436:28
[Editor: Move C.10 to here. It's good to have the array notes, but weird to have them between two unrelated sections' notes.]	447:37

2 Not sure what to do

The sentence "It allows the processor to assume that any nonpointer object not explicitly declared as a target may be referred to only by way of its original declared name" is not correct in that it ignores all of the other possible associations.	409:27-28
These elements of the table are antiques.	418:26,29
Ignores stream access.	419:2-4
The sentences	433:46-50

> A model for such an association is that descriptor values of the actual pointer are copied to the dummy pointer. If the actual pointer has an associated target, this target becomes accessible via the dummy pointer. If the dummy pointer becomes associated with a different target during execution of the procedure, this target will be accessible via the actual pointer after the procedure completes execution.

are not correct after adopting the "continuous association" model. Is it correct to delete the first sentence, and "will be accessible via the actual pointer after the procedure completes execution" ⇒ "becomes accessible via the actual pointer, and any pointer (not target) associated with it"?