Subject: Comments on Section 10
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: 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.	212:21
Editor: Did you plan to have two lines between the heading and body, or is there only one because it's a continuation?	216:2+
Appears to contradict [211:40-41]	217:42-44
We can write newlines by specifying ACHAR(10), but we can't read newlines at all. Is that asymmetry intended?	217:23+
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 10.10 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?