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##### This submission contains the proposed resolution of the following TBD editorial comments.

##### 1265, 2687, 2943, 1608, 1961, 2621, 1958, 1959, 2766, 2780,

##### 1284, 2359, 1291, 2926, 1292, 3099, 2024, 2025, 2694, 1246,

##### 1248, 1300, 1301, 1303, 1316, 1319, 1318, 1334, 1338, 1346.

##### The proposed changes are based on P802.11be D0.4.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1265 | 154.61 | 36.1.1 | "996+484+242" is missing a following dash | Add a dash, like the other RU sizes |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by the Editor during his routine editorial fix prior to the publication of D0.4 – see line 64, page 154.



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The proposed change has been implemented in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** |  | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2687 |  | 154.44 | 36.1.1 | Change "MCS" to "EHT-MCSs" | See Comment |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by the Editor during his routine editorial fix prior to the publication of D0.4 – see line 47, page 154.



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The proposed change has been implemented in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2621 | 161.07 | 36.2.2 | EXPANTION\_MAT | EXPANTION\_MAT -> EXPANSION\_MAT |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2943 | 154.63 | 36.1.1 | Terminology for MRU should be consistent. For example, there are ''52+26-", "26+52-tone MRU" and "26+52 tone MRU" etc. Similar for 106+26. | Use consistent terminology. |
| 1608 | 183.50 | 36.3.2.2 | Make the terminology for each MRU consistent in the entire spec. | See the comment. |
| 1961 | 185.15 | 36.3.2.3.2 | Change all the 26+52 tone MRU to 52+26 tone MRU, change all 26+106 tone MRU to 106+26 tone RU | As comment |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by the PDT submission 21/0104r3 and the Editor during his routine editorial fix.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 2943 and 1608 and 1961:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The proposed change has been implemented in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1958 | 175.38 | 36.3.2.1 | The EHT PHY subcarrier frequency spacing is identical to that of HE PHY subcarrier frequency spacing defined in Clause 27 (High Efficiency (HE) PHY specification). | delete "that of" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1959 | 183.28 | 36.3.2.1 | The subcarrier indices of a MRU consist of the indices of the corresponding RUs shown in Table 36-5 (Data and pilot subcarrier indices for RUs in an 80 MHz EHT PPDU), | Change "a MRU" to "an MRU" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2766 | 183.38 | 36.3.2.2 | Remove the word 'for' at the end of line #38 | as in comment |
| 2780 | 183.38 | 36.3.2.2 | Change "supports for" to "supports" | See comment |
| 1284 | 183.39 | 36.3.2.2 | Poor English (spurious "for"): "A 20 MHz, 80 MHz, or 160 MHz operating non-AP EHT STA is a non-AP EHT STA that supports for 20 MHz, 80 MHz, or 160 MHz channel width, respectively (see 36.1.1 (Introduction to the EHT PHY))." | Delete spurious "for" |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution for CIDs 2766, 2780, and 1284:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2359 | 183.49 | 36.3.2.2 | Add comma after "242-tone RU" | see comment |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1291 | 184.59 | 36.3.2.3.1 | Typo: "tones indices" | "tone indices" |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by the Editor during his routine editorial fix prior to the publication of D0.4 – see line 58, page 270.



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The proposed change has been implemented in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2926 | 184.59 | 36.3.2.3.1 | "The tones indices of the various RUs have been updated in relation to RUs defined for HE STAs" contains a temporal statement | change "have been updated" to "are updated" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1292 | 185.01 | 36.3.2.3.1 | Awkward English "RUs with equal to or more than 242 tones" | try "RUs with 242 or more tones" |
| 3099 | 185.01 | 36.3.2.3.1 | "RUs with equal to or more than 242 tones" should change to RUs with greater than or equal to 242 tones. | As in comment |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution for 1292:***

Accepted

***Proposed resolution for 3099:***

Revised. Replace “RUs with equal to or more than 242 tones” with “RUs with 242 or more tones”.

Note to the Editor: The proposed resolution is the same as CID 1292.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2024 | 185.12 | 36.3.2 | We already have the definition of MRU as multiple resource unit | change 'multiple RUs' to 'MRUs' |
| 2025 | 187.48 | 36.3.2.3.3 | We already have the definition of MRU as multiple resource unit | change 'multiple RUs' to 'MRUs' |

***Discussion:***



******

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 2024 and 2025:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2694 | 185.19 | 36.3.2.3.2 | "...fall within a 20 MHz channel boundary" should be "... fall within a 20 MHz channel". | See Comment The same change should be made in L26 of this page. |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

,

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1246 | 185.47 | 36.3.2.3.2 | Figure 36-5 3rd row, 2nd 26+52 RU should use dark color for the RU26 portion. Similar changes need for Figure 36-6 to 36-10 | as in comment |
| 1248 | 187.51 | 36.3.2.3.3 | For MRU definition, be consistent on large RU + Small RU like RU52+26, RU484+242 or small RU+large RU like RU26+52 or RU242+484 | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by the PDT submission 21/0104r3.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 1246 and 1248:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The proposed change has been implemented in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1300 | 191.28 | 36.3.2.3.3 | Incorrect "respectively" | Delete "respectively" |

***Discussion:***

******

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The correct page number is 192, not 191, in D0.3.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1301 | 194.28 | 36.3.2.4 | Spurious article | Delete "the" in "One of the three EHT-LTF types is used i..." |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1303 | 194.63 | 36.3.2.5 | These long parentheticals of MRU descriptors are spurious when a proper MRU table is available | When a proper MRU table is available, delete te MRU parentheticals at P195L63, P195L8, P195L19, and P195L33 |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by the PDT submission 21/0273r1.

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1316 | 206.40 | 36.3.6.4 | Inelegant English "for channel estimation purpose" | Try "for the purpose of channel estimation" or "for channel estimation purposes". Ditto P207L10 |

***Discussion:***

None.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised. Replace “for channel estimation purprose” with “for the purpose of channel estimation” at both locations.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1319 | 211.13 | 36.3.9 | "for data" is sloppy | Change to "for the Data field". Ditto P211L16, P211L12 |

***Discussion:***





***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1318 | 211.12 | 36.3.9 | Ordering of information does not reflect dependencies | Since T GI EHT-LTF is described in terms of T GI Data at L16, flip the order of these two rows |

***Discussion:***

******

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1334 | 221.46 | 36.3.10.4 | Missing article: "transmitted to single user," | Change to " transmitted to a single user," |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1338 | 223.25 | 36.3.10.4 | Missing article "For EHT-LTF field" | Change to "For the EHT-LTF field" |

***Discussion:***

The identified issue has been resolved by CIDs 1339 and 1341.

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 2943 and 1608:***

Accepted

Note to the Editor: The proposed change has been implemented in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1346 | 227.07 | 36.3.11.5 | "from a HE-PPDU" | "from an HE-PPDU" (i.e. from an aitch-ee- PPDU). Perform a case-sensitive search for "a HE" throughout the draft since there are many of these. |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted