

Subject: Comments on Section 1
 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.
-
- [Misleading if the processor implements IEEE support. Editor: Insert “, except that the method of rounding is specified if the processor implements the provisions of Section 14” after “processor”.] 2:4-5
-
- [To what does “the name” refer? Certainly not the processor, but it could be interpreted that way. It’s the name of the procedure, so say so. Editor: “name” ⇒ “procedure”. Also, “procedure” is used instead of “name” at [3:8].] 2:39
-
- [Same scoping unit as what? Editor: Insert “as a reference to it” after “(16)”.] 2:40
-
- [Be just as precise here as at [2:40]. Editor: Insert “in the same scoping unit as a reference to it” after “attribute”.] 3:9
-
- [Question for J3 to ponder – not yet an unresolved issue note: Is 1.6 normative? Should this material be moved to Annex B, which then should be called “Compatibility”?] 1.6
-
- [The term “noted” sounds nonnormative. Editor: “noted” ⇒ “specified”. 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
-
- [This paragraph says “except ... compatible”, and then goes on to say that any program conforming to the Fortran 95 standard conforms to this standard. It can’t be both. The next three paragraphs specify the differences. Editor: Insert “that does not depend on the differences specified here” after “program”.] 3:13
-
- [1.6.3 uses a numbered list. Editor: For consistency, make the paragraphs that begin at lines 14, 18 and 21 separate items in a numbered list.] 3:14-22
-
- [Editor: “than” ⇒ “from”.] 3:21
-
- [The term “noted” sounds nonnormative. Editor: second “noted” ⇒ “specified”. Question for the editor: Is it OK to say “this section” or should “this section” be “1.6.2”?] 3:24
-
- [Use the same style as at [3:12]. Editor: “(Fortran 90)” ⇒ “, informally referred to as Fortran 90”.] 3:25
-
- [The term “noted” sounds nonnormative. Editor: second “noted” ⇒ “specified”. Question for the editor: Is it OK to say “this section” or should “this section” be “1.6.3”?] 4:2
-
- [Use the same style as at [3:12]. Editor: “(FORTRAN 77)” ⇒ “, informally referred to as FORTRAN 77”.] 4:3
-
- [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

1	“remains”.]	
2	[Using “required” twice is awkward. Editor: First “required” ⇒ “specified”. Sentence is already	4:17
3	in past tense. Editor: Delete “was to”.]	
4	[Items (3) and (5) at [4:17-22] and [4:28-30] do not describe nailing-down of previously unspec-	4:27+
5	ified behavior; they describe different bahavior.]	
6	The following FORTRAN 77 features have different interpretations in this standard.	
7	[Editor: Move [4:17-22] to here, after making changes therein noted above.]	
8	[Editor: Insert “; “must” indicates an inevitable consequence of the provisions of this standard”	4:33
9	after “prohibition”.]	
10	[Shading sometimes doesn’t work. It probably will be present in the final printed ISO version.	4:37
11	But just to be precise, and to repair a run-on sentence, Editor: “identified ... nonnormative” ⇒	
12	“nonnormative; it is identified by being in a framed box that has a numbered heading beginning	
13	with the word NOTE. Depending on how the document is printed, it may also have a shaded	
14	background or a different text color”.]	
15	[Editor: Delete “are used to” because it’s just noise. There’s no “help” about the syntax rules.	4:39
16	They are <i>the</i> description of all but two or three of the syntax forms. Editor: Delete “help”.]	
17	[Remark to the editor: See how it looks if you convert the <code>longtable</code> to an <code>nbdesc</code> environment.	5:2+
18	This should also get line numbers turned on.	
19	[Editor: “which” ⇒ “that”.]	5:2+5 lines
20	[The constraints have not yet been discussed. Using “the” implies that they have. Editor:	5:11
21	Delete “the”.]	
22	[Editor: last three lines of <i>digit-string</i> examples should also be indented.]	5:11+6
23	[Editor: “When” ⇒ “If”.]	5:11+9
24	[Since the suffix <i>-spec</i> is used for several purposes, including “a few others,” it can’t be said	6:20-21
25	that it is “used consistently” for anything. Turn it around. Editor: “The suffix ... consistently”	
26	⇒ “The syntax rule names” at [6:20]; insert “, consistently have the suffix <i>-spec</i> ” after “fiers”	
27	at [6:21].]	
28	[Editor: “When” ⇒ “Where”.]	6:23
29	[It’s the descriptions of obsolet features, not the features, to which “Obsolescent ... size”	6:31-32
30	applies. Editor: “Obsolescent” ⇒ “Descriptions of obsolescent”. What does “distinguishing”	
31	mean? Note 1.3 isn’t normative. Editor: “distinguishing” ⇒ “smaller”.]	
32	[Editor: Delete “should” because it is redundant to “recommended”.]	7:6
33	[It doesn’t make sense to speak in the past tense about possible future events. Editor: “has	7:10
34	become” ⇒ “becomes”. The use of these features is already insignificant in all contexts other	
35	than Fortran programs. Editor: Delete “in Fortran programs”.]	
36	[The advice shouldn’t be restricted to the committee that develops the next revision. Editor:	7:11
37	Delete “from the next revision”.]	
38	[Question for the editor: Should “Standard ... arithmetic” be set in italic face?]	7:32