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##### This submission contains the proposed resolution of the following 32 editorial comments.

1313, 1315, 1310, 1348, 1387, 1399, 2699, 2767, 2660, 2947,

3167, 2639, 3082, 3083, 2640, 3085, 2768, 2626, 2725, 2726,

3174, 3178, 2769, 1255, 3080, 1409, 3104, 2650, 2651, 2692,

2702, 2703

##### The proposed changes are based on P802.11be D0.3.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

R1 – Remove CIDs 2661 and 2671

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Page | Clause | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 1313 | 200.05 | 36.3.5 | "BW" is an unnecessary contraction. | Convert "BW" to "bandwidth" in the text, excepting "PPDU BW field". Ditto P286L13, P303L53, P304L1 etc etc |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1315 | 202.25 | 36.3.5 | When comparing RU sizes, use "smaller than" rather than "less than" since an "RU label" is being compared not "a number of tones". Also use "an RU" | Check throughout clause 36 by searching on "a RU", "a MRU" or "RU less", and e.g. change "a RU/MRU less than or equal to 242-tone RU" is better as "an RU/MRU that is the same size or smaller than a 242-tone RU" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1310 | 198.01 | 36.3.4 | Paragraph layout differs from EHT MU paragraph layout | Merge this paragraph into the previous paragraph at P197L60 |

***Discussion:***

******

******

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1348 | 227.07 | 36.3.11.5 | Avoid starting a sentence with a conjunction unlike "And this remainder is used to differentiate an EHT-PPDU from a HE-PPDU." | Change "And this" to "This" |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1387 | 245.42 | 36.3.11.8.2 | Wrong case for "tail" | Change to "Tail". Ditto P245L47, P245L49, P260L14, P270L56, P270L60 etc etc (do a case-sensitive search in clause 36) |

***Discussion:***

The reason “tail” is used instead of “Tail” because the description does not contain the term “subfield”.

***Proposed resolution:***

Rejected. The reason “tail” is used instead of “Tail” because the description does not contain the term “subfield”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1399 | 250.57 | 36.3.11.8.3 | "for smaller than 242-tone RU" reads badly | Try "for RUs with fewer than 242 tones" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2699 | 196.06 | 36.3.3.1.1 | The title of this subclause should include MRU | Change the title to "Supported RU/MRU sizes in DL MU-MIMO" |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2767 | 197.30 | 36.3.3.2.4 | Change MU-MMO to MU-MIMO | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2660 | 197.41 | 36.3.4 | Incorrect sentence | Change sentence to "Two EHT PPDU formats are defined: EHT MU PPDU format and EHT TB PPDU format" |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2947 | 198.50 | 36.3.4 | "pre-HE modulated" should be "pre-EHT modulated" | Correct as suggested in the comment. |

***Discussion:***

******

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 3167 | 198.59 | 36.3.4 | TXVECVTOR | Change "TXVECVTOR" to "TXVECTOR" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: This typo is fixed during the Editor’s editorial check prior to the publication of D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2639 | 226.49 | 36.3.11.4 | Misc fixes to notation explanation of equation (36-14) | Replace "T\_{GI,L-EHT}" to "T\_{GI,L-LTF}" inside Table 36-9 (Timing-related constants). |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: This CID is resolved by CID #1317 and the typo is fixed in D0.4.

,

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 3082 | 226.03 | 36.3.11.3. | Reword "a value given in 27.3.11.2.1" with "a value as described in 27.3.11.2.1" | as in comment |
| 3083 | 226.52 | 36.3.11.4 | Reword "a value given in 27.3.11.2.1" with "a value as described in 27.3.11.2.1" | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution for CIDs 3082 and 3083:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2640 | 228.25 | 36.3.11.5 | Misc fixes to notation explanation of equation (36-16) | Replace "a value given in 27.3.11.2.1 (Cyclic shift for pre-HE modulated fields)" to "a value given in 36.3.11.2.1 (Cyclic shift for pre-EHT modulated fields)" |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: This CID is resolved by CID #3000 and the typo is fixed in D0.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 3085 | 229.14 | 36.3.11.7.2 | Reword the sentence as "These are the fields that will be consistent in location and interpretation within the U-SIG field across multiple IEEE 802.11 PHY amendments." | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

The issue on “amendment” has been resolved and replaced with “clauses” as shown in 326.15:



***Proposed resolution:***

Revised. At 326.15 in D0.4, replace “These are fields” with “These are the fields”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2768 | 229.26 | 36.3.11.7.2 | Need to replace 'Release 1' with another term | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

The issue has been resolved and replaced with the following in D0.4:



***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

Replace “For forward compatibility, EHT Release 1 defines an ER preamble while not defining an ER PPDU. This enables an EHT Release 1 STA to decode and interpret the version independent content in the U-SIG of an ER PPDU that may be introduced in future releases or amendments.” with “For forward compatibility, EHT defines an ER preamble while not defining an ER PPDU. An EHT STA with dot11EHTBaseLineFeaturesImplementedOnly equal to true shall be able to decode and interpret the version independent content in the U-SIG of an ER preamble that may be introduced in IEEE 802.11 PHY clauses that are defined for 2.4, 5, and 6 GHz spectrum from Clause 36 (Extremely high throughput (EHT) PHY specification) onwards. Regardless of the value of the PHY Version Identifier field in U-SIG, an EHT STA with dot11EHTBaseLineFeaturesImplementedOnly equal to true shall defer for the duration of the PPDU as defined in 36.3.22 (EHT receive procedure), report the information from the version independent fields within the RXVECTOR, and terminate the reception of the PPDU.”.

Note to the Editor: The replaced sentences exist in D0.4. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2626 | 229.33 | 36.3.11.7.2 | Edit description of types reserved bits and reserved values in U-SIG for better clarity. | Edit as follows: Reserved bits are divided in the PHY preamble or any reserved/unused states of the fields in the EHT portion of the PHY preamble are divided into two categories: Validate and Disregard |
| 2725 | 229.33 | 36.3.11.7.2 | The line "Reserved bits are divided in the PHY preamble or any reserved/unused states of the fields in the PHY preamble into two categories" has a problem | Change to "Reserved bits in the PHY preamble or any reserved/unused states of the fields in the PHY preamble are divided into two categories" |

***Discussion:***

The issue has been resolved and replaced with the following in D0.4:



***Proposed resolution for CIDs 2626 and 2725:***

Revised.

Replace “Reserved bits are divided in the PHY preamble or any reserved/unused states of the fields in the PHY preamble into two categories: Validate and Disregard.” with “Reserved fields in the EHT preamble or reserved states of the fields in the EHT preamble are divided into two categories: Validate and Disregard.”.

Note to the Editor: The replaced sentences exist in D0.4. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2726 | 229.42 | 36.3.11.7.2 | This line "subject to absence of any of the other Validate bits in the preamble being set to nondefault values and any of the other fields in the preamble not being set to a Validate state." has an issue | Change to "subject to, all of the other Validate bits in the preamble being set to default values and, any of the other fields in the preamble not being set to a Validate state." |

***Discussion:***

The issue has been resolved and replaced with the following in D0.4:



***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

Replace “On the other hand, if an EHT device sees Disregard bits set to any value, or field values of any field in the EHT PHY preamble are set to a Disregard state as defined in this subclause, it shall ignore these bits/states, and continue receiver processing subject to absence of any of the other Validate bits in the preamble being set to nondefault values and any of the other fields in the preamble not being set to a Validate state.” with “If an EHT STA sees any of the fields identified as Disregard for the STA set to a value that is different from its specified value in this subclause or field values of any field in the EHT preamble as being set to a value identified as Disregard for the STA in this subclause, it shall ignore these field values/states and they will have no impact on STA’s continued reception of the PPDU (i.e., reception at the STA can continue as usual).”

Note to the Editor: The replaced sentences exist in D0.4. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 3174 | 229.46 | 36.3.11.7.2 | "please" in a standard. :) | Delete "please" |
| 3178 | 231.26 | 36.3.11.7.2 | "please" in a standard :) | Delete "please" |

***Discussion:***

******



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2769 | 230.30 | 36.3.11.7.2 | add 'in' before the term 'UL' | as in comment |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1255 | 197.59 | 36.3.4 | Should be: "defined as in Figure" | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

******

***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 3080 | 194.54 | 36.3.2.5 | "the RU index is defined ..." should be reworded as "the RU indices are defined ..." | as in comment |

***Discussion:***

******

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised. Through the subclause 36.3.2.5 in D0.4, replace “the RU index is defined” with “the RU indices are defined”, and replace “the MRU index is defined” with “the MRU indices are defined”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1409 | 255.01 | 36.3.11.12 | using consistent naming for small MRUs, | using "26+52" or "26+106" instead of "52+26" "106+26". Ditto P288L48, 290L52, etc |

***Discussion:***

It has been decided to use “52+26” and “106+26” instead of “26+52” and “26+106”, respectively.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised. Through the draft D0.4, replace “26+52” and “26+106” with “106+26” and “52+26”, respectively.

Note to the Editor: The replaced sentencess exist in D0.4. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 3104 | 241.46 | 36.3.11.7.4 | Equation (36-11) should be replaced with (36-18) | As in comment |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

Note to the Editor: The equation number is fixed in D0.4. No further change is needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2650 | 292.20 | 36.3.12.3.5 | Typo in subscript of N\_punc in the description of LDPC encoding process for EHT MU PPDU | Change all instances of "N\_punc,c" to "N\_punc,u" |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2651 | 0.00 | 36.3.12.3.5 | Typo in equation (36-51) | Remove ",init" from the subscript of the LHS: N\_SYM,init = N\_SYM,init a\_init = a\_init |

***Discussion:***



***Proposed resolution:***

Accepted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2692 | 184.57 | 36.3.2.3.1 | The RU size should be named by x-tone RU | Change RU26, etc. to 26-tone RU, etc. |

***Discussion:***

None

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised. Change “RU<tone size>” with “<tone size> tone RU” throughout D0.4, except if it is a subscript of a symbol in an equation.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2702 | 229.25 | 36.3.11.7.2 | The following sentence is not accurate: The size of the U-SIG for EHT MU PPDU and EHT TB PPDU is two symbols. | Suggest change it to "The length of the U-SIG field for EHT MU PPDU and EHT TB PPDU is two OFDM symbols." |

***Discussion:***

As referred to 326.27 and 326.37 in D0.4:



***Proposed resolution:***

Revised.

At 326.27 and 326.37, replace “The size of the U-SIG” with “The length of the U-SIG field”, and replace “symbols” with “OFDM symbols”.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 2703 | 229.37 | 36.3.11.7.2 | "EHT PHY preamble " is not defined | Just use "PHY preamble". (two places in this paragraph) |

***Discussion:***

As per the discussion related to CID 2175, “EHT PHY preamble” and “PHY preamble” are replaced by “EHT preamble”.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised. Replace “EHT PHY preamble” with “EHT preamble”.

Note to the Editor: This CID is implemented by CID 2175.