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Abstract:

This document contains comment resolutions on the following CIDs in draft 6.0:

24091，24185, 24186, 24300, 24301, 24500, 24501.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24091 |  |  |  | Do we really use DCM? As it is likely to allow assigning multiple RUs to a single STA in 802.11be, this scheme seems to be becoming not much attractive. | Delete DCM feature from the draft. | Rejected.  DCM is not related to Multiple RUs to a single STA. DCM is used to enhance the range and multiple RUs are for higher spectrual efficiency. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24185 | 27.3.11.3 | 550 | 20 | "The equation applies to all contiguous signals up to 160 MHz and non contiguous 80+80  MHz.". Later it specifies that this also applies to cases with preamble puncturing (line 63), which appears inconsistent. | Delete this sentence | Rejected:  This is sentence is particularly for equation all the PPDUs including SU and ER SU PPDU. Line 63 is for HE TB PPDU, HE sound-ing NDP or HE MU PPDU. |
| 24186 | 27.3.11.3 | 551 | 17 | "If the TXVECTOR parameter BEAM\_CHANGE is 0, the time domain representation of the L-STF field shall be as specified in Equation (27-8). The equation applies to all contiguous signals up to 160 MHz and non contiguous 80+80 MHz."  "all contiguous signals" is not correct, since BEAM\_CHANGE is only present for SU and ER SU (See Table 27-1) | Correct | Rejected.  Since it is claear that BEAM\_CHANGE indication only exists in HE-SIGA of SU and ER SU PPDUs. There is no ambinguity. It is not necessary to clarify the usage of a feature in any places that related to the feature.  Note if changed here, there are many places in the draft using the same sentence. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24300 | 27.3.11.7.2 | 567 | 25 | "For 40 MHz two Spatial Reuse fields with Spatial Reuse 3 field identical in value to the Spatial Reuse 1 field and Spatial Reuse 4 field identical in value to Spatial Reuse 2 field. The Spatial Reuse fields only apply to the 20 MHz used for the transmission." -- shouldn't that be "in the 40 MHz", by analogy with the preceding bullet? | As it says in the comment | Rejected.  All the bullets use “for xx MHz…”.  “The Spatial Reuse fields only apply to the 20 MHz used for the transmission." is correct. |
| 24301 | 27.3.11.7.2 | 567 | 25 | "For 40 MHz two Spatial Reuse fields with Spatial Reuse 3 field identical in value to the Spatial Reuse 1 field and Spatial Reuse 4 field identical in value to Spatial Reuse 2 field. The Spatial Reuse fields only apply to the 20 MHz used for the transmission." -- is the intent to say "respectively"? | Change to "For 40 MHz two Spatial Reuse fields with Spatial Reuse 3 field identical in value to the Spatial Reuse 1 field and Spatial Reuse 4 field identical in value to Spatial Reuse 2 field. Each of the Spatial Reuse  fields only applies to the corresponding 20 MHz used for the transmission." | Accepted. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24501 | 27 |  |  | The HE-SIG field content tables should not be in terms of what the TXVECTOR was set to at the transmitter, since this is invisible and irrelevant to the receiver. What matters is that each possible field value means. The resolution to CID 22385 claims this has all been addressed, but there are still issues at 556.50/560.39/564.21 (should be "See..."), 557.36 (should say 0 means periodicity 10, 1 means 20; see TXVECTOR blah), 557.40/562.29/566.48, 560.48, 564.38/565.28/565.53/566.30 | At 557.36 change "B25 is set to 0 if TXVECTOR parameter MIDAMBLE\_PERIODICITY is 10 and set to 1 if TXVECTOR parameter MIDAMBLE\_PERIODICITY is 20." to "B25 is set to 0 for 10 symbol midamble periodicity, to 1 for 20 symbol midamble periodicity. See TXVECTOR parameter MIDAMBLE\_PERIODICITY." and remove the preceding paragap. | Accepted. |
| 24500 | 27 |  |  | The HE-SIG field content tables should not be in terms of what the TXVECTOR was set to at the transmitter, since this is invisible and irrelevant to the receiver. What matters is that each possible field value means. The resolution to CID 22385 claims this has all been addressed, but there are still issues at 556.50/560.39/564.21 (should be "See..."), 557.36 (should say 0 means periodicity 10, 1 means 20; see TXVECTOR blah), 557.40/562.29/566.48, 560.48, 564.38/565.28/565.53/566.30 | As it says in the comment | Resolved in CID 24501 in this document. |