**Proposal for C2Y**
**WG14 N3500**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title:** | Clarification for complex suffix specification |
| **Author, affiliation:** | C FP group |
| **Date:** | 2025-02-14 |
| **Proposal category:** | Technical |
| **Reference:** | N3435 |

6.4.5.3 #2 states "A floating suffix shall not designate a type that the implementation does not provide." The two occurrences of "not" might be confusing. If the implementation supports decimal types, does `1.0dfi` present a constraint violation? The combination `dfi` does not describe a type because C does not specify complex decimal types. One might think the constraint that the suffix "shall not designate a type that the implementation does not provide" is satisfied because the combination of suffixes doesn't designate any type. A suggested change below is intended to express the intent unambiguously. (If the implementation does not support decimal types, the `df` suffix presents a constraint violation, as noted in footnote 66.)

In 6.4.5.3 #5, the first two sentences are about complex suffixes. The rest of the paragraph is about something else, namely unsuffixed literals and literals with real floating suffixes, and should be in a new paragraph.

**Suggested changes:**

In 6.4.5.3 #2, change

> A floating suffix shall ~~not~~ designate a type that the implementation ~~does not~~ provides.

In 6.4.5.3 #5, introduce a new paragraph after the first two sentences, i.e. beginning with

> An unsuffixed floating literal ...