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Abstract:

This document contains comment resolutions for CID 24207 in draft 6.0.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** | **Resolution** |
| 24207 | 27.3.19.4.3 | 653 | 21 | "For 1024-QAM, the relative constellation error shall meet one of the following requirements".This is a very bizarre way of expressing a requirement: as a mandatory choice between two requirements that are formulated as mandatory ("shall"). Trying to parse the requirement it means that de facto, meeting -35 dB if amplitude drift compensation is disabled becomes optional (i.e. not mandatory to implement to meet the full requirement). Also, if the first requirement were to be chosen, what is the required value if drift compensation is enabled? | Clean up formulation of this requirement | Revise. 11ax editor, please see the discussion for instructions of CID 24185 in IEEE 802.11-11-20/1123r0. |

**Discussions for CID 24207:**

The text in the draft D6.1 is as follows:



There are two reuqirements. If a product meets the requirement of the first bullet (one test), it does not need to do two tests for the rquirements of the second bullet. If a product only meets the requirements of the second bullet (two tests), the product also meets the 1024-QAM EVM equirement.

So basically, a product can claim it meets the 1024-QAM EVM requirement if the product meets either one the the two requirements.

***TGax Editor: Please make the following changes (changed texts are in red) in the line 21-22 on page 656 of D6.1:***

For 1024-QAM, the relative constellation error shall meet either one of the following requirements: