Summary of Comments on Untitled Document

Page: 37

Sequence number: 1
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:16:48 AM
Type: Note
"imported" should be "imported"

Sequence number: 2
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:18:02 AM
Type: Note
"implementation" should be "implementations".

Sequence number: 3
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:18:36 AM
Type: Note
"Verilog legacy" should be "the legacy Verilog"

Sequence number: 4
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:19:56 AM
Type: Note
What exactly are you referring to by "the argument matching rules"? Is it "SystemVerilog's normal argument matching rules"? Or is it "DPI's normal argument matching rules"? Please spell it out here. A cross-reference to such rules would be nice as well.

Sequence number: 5
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:20:22 AM
Type: Note
"the formal one" should be "the corresponding formal argument"

Sequence number: 6
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:20:41 AM
Type: Note
"more general" should be "generalized"

Sequence number: 7
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:21:13 AM
Type: Note
"the actual arguments" should be "actual arguments"

Page: 38

Sequence number: 1
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:36:17 AM
Type: Note
"an" should be "the"

Sequence number: 2
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:36:31 AM
I think an example of a non-source compatible fragment of C code should be given to make this constraint crystal-clear. Could you provide one, please?

Can you please copy this clarifying paragraph into the SV-side document as well? I think it clarifies the grounds behind the WYSIWYG principle in a valuable way.

Actually I don't think these two things are similar. Please change "Similarly, a SystemVerilog compiler will naturally..." to "Further, a SystemVerilog compiler will naturally..."
This section doesn't specify if it is discussing formal arguments for *export* or *import* function declarations. If all semantic constraints on arguments apply to both categories of function, please state that explicitly. If some constraints apply only to one category, please state that explicitly.

Sequence number: 3
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:50:41 AM
Type: Note
   "an imported function" should be a "non-context imported function"

Sequence number: 4
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:52:28 AM
Type: Note
   "a call of non-context function" should be "a call of a non-context imported function". Also, I wonder if you shouldn't change the general term "imported function" to "import function" in this area? Just a thought... in any case the term used should probably be consistent throughout the document.

Page: 41

Sequence number: 1
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:53:44 AM
Type: Note
   "imported" should be "import" here, for sure, since the term "import declaration" was formally defined at the top of the SV-side document.

Sequence number: 2
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 6:55:21 AM
Type: Note
   "the equivalent one-dimensional packed array shall be normalized" should be "it will be normalized into an equivalent one-dimensional array".

Page: 43

Sequence number: 1
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 7:24:08 AM
Type: Note
   Please resolve this "cross-reference prototype"

Page: 46

Sequence number: 1
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 11:00:40 AM
Type: Note
   "SV" should be "SystemVerilog"

Sequence number: 2
Author: dwarmke
Date: 3/27/2003 11:01:07 AM
Type: Note
   "imported declaration" should be "import declaration"
I will send a separate ASCII email with instructions for modifying this section based on our latest compromise on handling user data.

It would be nice to format this comment more cleanly - i.e. with good indentation like the other comments in this area.

I will send ASCII via email that should replace this example.

Didn't we rename svHandle to svOpenArrayHandle? Please adjust this area accordingly. Maybe we need to state that a vpiHandle is not equivalent to a svScope.

This kind of block comment reads the most professionally and looks the best, IMO. We should standardize on this style (or if not this one, some agreed-upon alternative) everywhere block comments are made in examples and include files.

This area of the file needs to be adjusted as per my forthcoming ASCII email.

I suggest all these strike-throughs be removed in draft 0.8, so that the other committees have an easier time reading through this section.