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***Comment Indices #1362 in 15-24-0371-13-04ab-consolidated-comments\_draft\_1.0***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Sub-Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1360 | Pooria Pakrooh | 10.38.9.3.11 | 85 | 3 | Why number of RSF/RIF MAC param? it is part of the MMS PHY packet. Clarify whether these are Phy or MAC parameters. | as in comment |

**Discussion:** Agree with the suggestion.

**Resolution: Revised**

**Notes to the Editor:**

1. Remove the title of subclause
2. Add bits 0-5 of Figure 53 to the end of Figure 52, by replacing the reserved bits.

***Comment Indices #1360 in 15-24-0371-13-04ab-consolidated-comments\_draft\_1.0***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Sub-Clause** | **Page** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed Change** |
| 1362 | Pooria Pakrooh | 10.38.9.3.17 | 88 | 16 | This sequence mapping can be applied to control sequence since it is HPRF, but SYNC/SFD sequence for the MMRS packet is better to be 127 for RSF=127 to keep PRF consistent.. | as in comment |

**Discussion:** Agree with the suggestion. It should be clarified that the UWB driven MMS mode, SYNC/SFD sequences should be chosen to match the code indices used in the RSFs.

**Resolution: Revised**

**Notes to the Editor:**

Change Page 88 line 16 as follows:

“When UWB modulation is selected for the control and/or the report phase, the preamble code index used for these UWB packets during the control and report phase are based on the Sequence Code Index field as carried in the Ranging PHY Configuration field defined in 10.38.9.3.10. Sequence Code Index field values 25 to 32, directly indicate the UWB packet preamble code index, while for Sequence Code Index field values 33 to 48, the UWB packet code index is selected by the expression: 25 + (Sequence Code Index field value - 1) modulo 8, i.e., selecting one of the length-91 ternary codes from Table 16-9. For the ranging phase, the SYNC/SFD code index should be selected as specified in 10.38.9.3.10. , where Sequence Code Index field values 9 to 24 select length-127 ternary codes from Table 16-8, Sequence Code Index field values 25 to 32, select length-91 ternary codes from Table 16-9,”