

Subject: Comments on Clause 6
 From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

2 Edits refer to 06-007r1. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other instructions, a
 3 page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to be replaced by associated
 4 text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that associated text is to be inserted after
 5 (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

6 [Editor: Append “A *type-param-inquiry* is a scalar even if *designator* is an array.” to provide normative 119:17
 7 support for the final sentence of the first paragraph of Note 6.9. Otherwise append “The shape of a
 8 *type-param-inquiry* is the shape of *designator*.” and delete the final sentence of the first paragraph of
 9 Note 6.9.]

10 [What is the point of a one-line subclause? Editor: Delete “**6.2.2.1 Array elements**”.] 121:12

11 [Editor: Delete the first paragraph, since it duplicates 2.4.5. Move the second paragraph to to [122:1-], 122:2-4
 12 removing the cross reference in the process.]

13 [For positive stride, we say “not greater than” while for negative stride we say “equal to or greater than”. 122:23,123:2
 14 Can we make these parallel? Editor: Replace “equal to or greater than” at [123:2] by “not less than”.]

15 [Either we need “in the statement” in C627 and C630, or we don’t need it in C628. It can’t be because 125:10, 14-15
 16 of “any” since that appears in C630. I prefer not to have it in C628. Editor: Delete it. Then combine
 17 C630 into C628 by appending “is unlimited polymorphic, or is of abstract type,” before “either” and
 18 delete C630.]

19 [Specify the type parameters. Editor: “its dynamic ... declared type” ⇒ “the same dynamic type and 126:9-10
 20 type parameters with which it is declared”.]

21 [This paragraph is entirely devoid of new information. Editor: Delete it.] 128:7-8

22 [Given [128:9] there should be no question that the allocation status of an allocatable variable can change. 128:13
 23 Editor: Delete “; the status ... procedure”.]

24 [Given [128:9] there should be no question that the allocation status of an allocatable variable can change. 128:15
 25 Editor: Delete “; the status ... program”.]

26 [Given [128:9] there should be no question that the allocation status of an allocatable variable can change. 128:16-17
 27 Editor: Delete “; the status ... construct”.]

2 Questions without edits

29 Ought to be in 2.4.4 (except for [116:8], which is already there). It’s weird that **6.1.2 Structure com-** 116:5-8
 30 **ponents** is a subsection of **6.1 Scalars**, given that a lot of the former is about arrays and array sections.
 31 **6.1.3 Complex part** is also independent of the rank. Maybe the title of 6.1 should be **Subobjects**.

32 How does this prevent remote reallocation? 117:12

33 This seems like a weird place for this constraint. Shouldn’t it be based on object declarations, not 117:13-14
 34 references?

35 I don’t understand the last two phrases of C623. Should the middle one be “the *designator* of the 120:20-21
 36 *complex-part-designator* shall be an array” or perhaps more simply “the *complex-part-designator* shall
 37 be an array”? What does “other” mean in the third one?

38 Is it OK for an array section to be the *selector* in an ASSOCIATE or SELECT TYPE statement if the 123:10-11
 39 *associate-name* appears in a variable-definition context within the construct?

40 Can't these constraints be put on the declarations? After all, an object can't be allocated if it doesn't 125:31-32
41 have the ALLOCATABLE or POINTER attributes.