

Fortran 202Y Suggestions

July 19, 2022

WG5 members were asked to submit a list of five suggested features/changes for Fortran 202Y. This paper collates the suggestions received to date. Where available, links to elaboration are provided. If more than one person suggested an idea, the number of submissions is noted and sorted to top. Other than that, no order is implied.

Note: Several people suggested generics/templates, but this is already accepted for 2Y by WG5

- (4) Standardize cpp-like preprocessor https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/65
- (2) Better error handling https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/6
- (2) Delete default implicit typing https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/90
- (2) Delete implied SAVE for initialized variables https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/40
- (2) scan / prefix sum https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/273 Namespace for modules: https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/1
- (2) Make it easier to process assumed-rank arguments in Fortran code https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/74
- Deprecate (not delete) default implicit typing
- Deprecate D format edit descriptor https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/226
- Disallow use of specific (standard provides a list) new-to-2Y features in a program unit that also uses a deprecated or deleted feature https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/280
- Somehow fix the issue of mixed precision
- fetch-and-op atomics in DO CONCURRENT https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/270
- asynchronous blocks / tasks (equivalent to OpenACC async and OpenMP non-dependent tasks) <https://github.com/llvm/llvm-project/blob/main/flang/docs/DoConcurrent.md> documents problems with DO CONCURRENT. These problems have also been discussed at https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/62 and in J3 paper 19-134 (<https://j3-fortran.org/doc/year/19/19-134.txt>).
- Pointer intent (deferred from 202X) https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/5
- Surprising results of LBOUND and UBOUND when argument has zero extent https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/254
- Change floating point model to reflect IEEE 754 so that intrinsic examples aren't as surprising. https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/268
- Augmented assignment (+=, etc.) https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/113
- "intrinsic for scan (prefix sum)" https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/273 or "scan clause for do concurrent reduce" https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/224
- allow immediate return from collective subroutines https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/272
- additional collective subroutines https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/223

- log2 https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/222
- Go thru all the processor dependencies, and try to eliminate as many as practical, without undue burden on the implementors or host/target operating system, ... Perhaps add something similar to ISO_ENV stuff to give the user compile/runtime knowledge of what are now processor dependencies in some cases.
- Make an effort to re-organize the standard to make it more readable. I don't know if this is practical, and maybe we don't have enough editorial resources to do this, but a small piece at a time approach is likely the best way to start and see if this suggestion is viable.
- Add a second project editor. This is generally a good practice, even if the primary editor continues to do most of the work.
- Allow immediate return from collective subroutines https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/272
- co_scan {inclusive, exclusive} https://github.com/j3-fortran/fortran_proposals/issues/223
- co_reduce_scatter
- co_gather
- co_scatter
- Units of measure
- Block-structured exceptions
- Coroutines and iterators
- Updaters or accessors or containers
- Fork-join construct (not asynchronous blocks). As Bill Long has pointed out, this is just syntactic sugar for DO CONCURRENT with SELECT CASE inside it.