

Subject: Comments on section 2
 From: Van Snyder
 References: 01-195r1

This paper contains the comments from 01-195r1, updated for 01-007r2.

[Conflicts with [9:11-12] and [231:38-39]. Editor: Delete “unit”.]	12:9
Type-bound procedures, dummy procedures and procedure pointers should be mentioned at this point.	§2.2.3.4+
The appearance of “to define” and “defining” in such intimate juxtaposition is uncomfortable. “define” ⇒ “specify”?	§2.4.0
An expression or function reference may produce a pointer, which is not a data entity – at least not according to the definition in 2.4.3.	§2.4.3.2,3
Do we need 2.4.6$\frac{1}{2}$ Allocatable ? Or should “allocatable” be discussed in §2.4.3.1.1?	§2.4.6+
Should pointer association status be discussed in this subclause?	§2.5.4
Derived types and procedures are defined, not declared. That’s why the discussion is in this subclause. Therefore, “declaration” isn’t the appropriate word here. Maybe “specification” would be better.	19:29
Do pointers need special treatment here?	19:31-32