

rules in these languages, and easily allows future extensions of functionality. The mechanism for opaque objects used here loosely follows the POSIX Fortran binding standard.

The explicit separation of handles in user space and objects in system space allows space-reclaiming and deallocation calls to be made at appropriate points in the user program. If the opaque objects were in user space, one would have to be very careful not to go out of scope before any pending operation requiring that object completed. The specified design allows an object to be marked for deallocation, the user program can then go out of scope, and the object itself still persists until any pending operations are complete.

The requirement that handles support assignment/comparison is made since such operations are common. This restricts the domain of possible implementations. The alternative **in C** would have been to allow handles to have been an arbitrary, opaque type. This would force the introduction of routines to do assignment and comparison, adding complexity, and was therefore ruled out. **In Fortran, the handles are defined such that assignment and comparison are available through the operators of the language or overloaded versions of these operators.** (*End of rationale.*)

*Advice to users.* A user may accidentally create a dangling reference by assigning to a handle the value of another handle, and then deallocating the object associated with these handles. Conversely, if a handle variable is deallocated before the associated object is freed, then the object becomes inaccessible (this may occur, for example, if the handle is a local variable within a subroutine, and the subroutine is exited before the associated object is deallocated). It is the user's responsibility to avoid adding or deleting references to opaque objects, except as a result of MPI calls that allocate or deallocate such objects. (*End of advice to users.*)

*Advice to implementors.* The intended semantics of opaque objects is that opaque objects are separate from one another; each call to allocate such an object copies all the information required for the object. Implementations may avoid excessive copying by substituting referencing for copying. For example, a derived datatype may contain references to its components, rather than copies of its components; a call to `MPI_COMM_GROUP` may return a reference to the group associated with the communicator, rather than a copy of this group. In such cases, the implementation must maintain reference counts, and allocate and deallocate objects in such a way that the visible effect is as if the objects were copied. (*End of advice to implementors.*)

## 2.5.2 Array Arguments

An MPI call may need an argument that is an array of opaque objects, or an array of handles. The array-of-handles is a regular array with entries that are handles to objects of the same type in consecutive locations in the array. Whenever such an array is used, an additional `len` argument is required to indicate the number of valid entries (unless this number can be derived otherwise). The valid entries are at the beginning of the array; `len` indicates how many of them there are, and need not be the size of the entire array. The same approach is followed for other array arguments. In some cases `NULL` handles are considered valid entries. When a `NULL` argument is desired for an array of statuses, one uses `MPI_STATUSES_IGNORE`.