

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.] 3:5
-
- [Editor: “, informally ... 95,” ⇒ “(Fortran 95)”.] 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” ⇒ “specified”. 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 shaded, framed boxes that have 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+

1	[Editor: “which” ⇒ “that”.]	5:2+5 lines
2	[The constraints have not yet been discussed. Using “the” implies that they have. Editor:	5:11
3	Delete “the”.]	
4	[Editor: last three lines of <i>digit-string</i> examples should also be indented.]	5:11+6-8
5	[Editor: “When” ⇒ “If”.]	5:11+9
6	[Editor: Indent.]	5:11+10-13
7	[Editor: “When” ⇒ “Where”.]	6:23
8	[It’s the descriptions of obsolescent features, not the features, to which “Obsolescent ... size”	6:31-32
9	applies. Editor: “Obsolescent ... distinguishing” ⇒ “The descriptions of obsolescent features	
10	appear in a smaller”.]	
11	[Editor: Delete “should” because it is redundant to “recommended”.]	7:6
12	[It doesn’t make sense to speak in the past tense about possible future events. Editor: “has	7:10
13	become” ⇒ “becomes”. The use of these features is already insignificant in all contexts other	
14	than Fortran programs. Editor: Delete “in Fortran programs”.]	
15	[The advice shouldn’t be restricted to the committee that develops the next revision. Editor:	7:11
16	Delete “from the next revision”.]	
17	[Question for the editor: Should “Standard ... arithmetic” be set in italic face?]	7:32

2 Unresolved issue 340

19 Issue 340 reads:

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

22 Interpretation 87 (MOD and MODULO intrinsic functions with zero divisor) and interpretation
23 92 (Values of the PAD= Specifier in the INQUIRE Statement) have been included in Technical
24 Corrigendum 2. The edits of these interpretations include text meant for the compatibility
25 section. These edits are reproduced below.

26	[Editor: Remove.]	3:18-20
----	-------------------	---------

27	The PAD= specifier in the INQUIRE statement in this standard returns the value UNDEFINED	3:26+
28	if there is no connection or the connection is for unformatted input/output. Fortran 90 specified	
29	YES.	

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

32	[Editor: Delete unresolved issue 340 note.]	3:26+1-4
----	---	----------