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 Abstract

This submission proposes resolutions for following 4 CIDs received for TGbe LB266:

10761 10838 10839 10964

**TGbe editor: The baseline for this document is 11be D2.0. In the resolution, the page and line in D2.1 are also added as a note to the editor.**

# CID 10761, 10838, 10839

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Pg/Ln** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 10761 | 36.3.13.8 | 721.12 | N\_RU\_or\_MRU is not defined. It can be replaced by N\_RU according to the definition in Table 36-23. The same notation also appears on P721L49 and P722L22. | As in comment | AcceptedNote: Medications in D2.1 (Pg/Ln) P733/L12, P733/L49 and P734/L22**.** |
| 10838 | 36.3.13.8 | 720.25 | Change all "80 MHz subblock" with " 80 MHz frequency subblock" in clause 36.3.13.8 | As in the comment. | Revised11be Editor: please make the changes as in the proposed change and also the Table 36-52 title.Note: Medications in D2.1 (Pg/Ln) P732/L25 |
| 10839 | 36.3.13.8 | 720.44 | Change all " subblock" with " frequency subblock" in clause 36.3.13.8 | As in the comment. | Revised11be Editor: please make the changes as in the proposed change and the following locations in clause 36.3.13.8 (in D2.1) (Pg/Ln):P732/L42P732/L44P732/L45P732/L48P732/L51P732/L62P733/L13P733/L18P733/L21P733/L24P733/L33P733/L50P733/L60P733/L62P733/L2P733/L14 |

**CID 10964**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10964 | 36.3.13.8 | 721.13 | Per description of NSD\_l, it should also include "r" as part of subscript. | Change it to NSD\_r\_l or NSD\_l\_r | Rejected. This comment is worth some discussion. Please see the discussions on CID 10964.  |

**Discussions on CID 10964:**

Firstly, NSD\_l indeed does not fully reflect the r-th RU or MRU in the l-th subblock. Similarly, DTM\_l also not does not fully reflect the r-th RU or MRU either.

Secondly, the suggestion to add r to NSD\_l does not make too much sense either because NSD\_r\_l is not directly related to the order of RU or MRU r, instead, NSD\_r\_l is related to the size of the r-th RU or MRU. For a fixed r, NSD\_r\_l can still be different. Therefore, adding r as a subindex does not help.

Thirdly, subindex l is indeed needed because l can be different values for RU or MRU larger than 996.

Given the above three arguments. I suggest we keep NSD\_l and DTM\_l  due to the following two reasons:

1. It is very clear in the standard that NSD\_l is the number of data subcarriers for a certain sized RU or MRU. So there is no confusion to use subindex l only. Similarly, DTM\_l is a parameter determined by a certain sized RU or MRU.
2. In IEEE 802.11ax, we also use NSD\_l instead of NSD\_r\_l.

