Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Commenter Name:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	Comment Type:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatified Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
1	Allen, James	0	0	0	e		This assumes the formatting problems continue to be addressed before sponsor ballot.			A	C	
2	Gilb, James	1.1	1	24-25	e	N	The phrase "To define PHY …" is not a complete sentence.	Make a complete sentence, perhaps adding "This scope of this standard is to define PHY …"		R	C	Paragraph 1.1 is the PAR scope.
3	Bisdikian, Chatschik	1.2	1	40	e		(PDAs)/ Handheld	(PDAs), Handhelds		A	C	
4	Gilb, James	1.2	1	35-36	e	N	The phrase "To provide a standard" is not a complete sentence.	Make a complete sentence, perhaps changing it to "This standard provides for low …"		A	C	
5	Gilb, James	1.3	2	20-22	e	N	The last dashed list item should be a separate paragraph rather than a list item since it indicates things that are not in the standard rather than things that are in the standard.	Change paragraph format from "DL, Dashed List" to "T, Text"		A	C	
6	Gilb, James	3	5	24-25	e	N	The second sentence, beginning "It may be based …" is not clear, particularly the second clause of the or statement "… or given the existence of …".	Delete the word "given"		A	C	
7	Gilb, James	3	5	27-29	e	N	The list of things exchanged uses two and's, it should be item 1, item 2 and item 3	Change "… real-time voice and data ..." to "… real-time voice, data …"		A	C	
8	Gilb, James	3	5, 6	36, 46, 52, 1 (p 6)	e	N	The Bluetooth HCI, L2CAP, LMP and Radio are not a documents, they are a part of a document, actually two documents. The HCI is an interface, the L2CAP and LMP are an protocols, and the Radio is, well a radio.	Delete the sentence beginning with "A document that …" from the first three, for the last (Radio), change the first sentence to "A transciever that operates in the 2.4 GHz ISM band and complies with the 802.15.1 standard."		A	C	Delete Radio, Baseband, LMP, & L2CAP. Bluetooth HCI retained since not wholely contained in this standard.
9	Gilb, James	3	7	7	e	N	Extra wording, "(ACL link)"	Delete "(ACL link)"		R	C	The ACL link is the only link that supports isochronous user channel
10	Gilb, James	3	7	19, 25	e	N	Extra wording, "(Erratum 1040)"	Delete "(Erratum 1040)"		A	C	
11	Gilb, James	3	7	39	e	N	Extra wording, "(State Variable)"	Delete "(State Variable)"		R	C	This definition is for the Page State. Used to distinguish from page definition.
12	Gilb, James	3	8	13	e	N	Extra wording, "(RFCOMM server)"	Delete "(RFCOMM server)"		R	C	RFCOMM server is the "another application"
13	Gilb, James	3	8	15	e	N	No space between i.e. and setting	Add space between i.e. and setting		A	C	
14	Gilb, James	3	8	29	e	N	"connection1" should be "connection oriented link"	Change "connection1" to "connection oriented link"		A	C	
15	Gilb, James	3	9	1	e	N	"Un-known" should be "Unknown"	Change as indicated		A	C	
16	Cypher, David	4	13	21	e		What is M_ADDR? Or where is it used?	Delete if it is not used		A	C	
17	Gilb, James	4	11-16	various	e	N	There is not a consistent application of capitalization to the acronym definitions. Some common words are capitalized, e.g. Call Control on 11, line 24, most are not.	Lower case all words except proper names and other acronyms		A	C	
18	Gilb, James	4	12	25-26	e	N	No space between Application and SW	Add space between Application and SW		A	C	
19	Gilb, James	4	13	8	e	N	LFSR is defined twice	Delete second definition		A	C	
20	Gilb, James	4	14	14	e	N	PM_ADDR is defined twice	Delete second definition		A	C	
21	Gilb, James	4	14	22	e	N	ppm is listed as PPM, although an acronym, ppm is almost universally used in lower case format	Change "PPM" to "ppm"		A	C	
22	Gilb, James	4	14	42	e	N	RX is defined twice	Delete second definition		A	C	
23	Gilb, James	4	14	53	e	N	SCO is technically "Synchronous Connection-Oriented" with no link, i.e. you refer to it as a SCO link rather than just a SCO.	Delete the word "link"		A	C	
24	Gilb, James	4	15	5	e	N	SEQN is defined twice	Delete second definition		A	C	
25	Gilb, James	4	15	30	e	N	"Test Control" is repeated twice	Delete the second occurance of "Test Control"		A	C	
26	Gilb, James	4	15	52	e	N	The acronym UIAC does not appear anywhere in the 802.15.1 standard (and I don't recall it from the BT specification either, but that is not surprising). I checked both PDF's (via text search) and UIAC only appears in the acronym definition section of either document.	Delete the definition of the acronym UIAC		A	C	
27	Gilb, James	5	17	3	e	N	No "and" in "profiles, test specifications"	Change "profiles, test specifications" to "profiles and test specifications"		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) *LB8 Reply Comment.*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
28	Gilb, James	5.2	17	35	e	N	Missing "of" in "Clauses 7-11 the standard"	Change to "Clauses 7-11 of the standard"		A	C	
29	Gilb, James	5.2	17	44	e	N	Words "also" and "is" flipped in "Annex A also is derived text"	Change to "Annex A is also a derived text"		A	C	
30	Gilb, James	5.2	17	47-48	e	N	Font size for "(L2CAP, LMP and Baseband)" is too small	Change font size to match the rest of the paragraph		A	C	
31	Gilb, James	5.2	20	20	e	N	Extra letter B in third column of Annex B description	Delete "B" from "B Specification and Description ..."		A	C	
32	Watanabe, Fujio	5.2	18	22	e	n	Figure number is incorrect			A	C	
33	Watanabe, Fujio	5.2	18	24	e	n	In Figure Figure…	In Figure		A	C	
34	Camp, Michael	6.1	21	18	e	N	Awkward phrase: "have an increasing data capability"	Reword: "have increased data capabilities"		A	C	
35	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.3	27	8	e		...and a set interoperable…	...and a set of interoperable…		A	C	
36	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.3	27	11	e		…in the specifications. This…	…in the specification. This…		A	C	
37	Gilb, James	6.3	27	1-22	e	N	Figure 4 overlaps the text for section 6.3, but it belongs with section 6.2.3.3. In addition, the text wrapping around the figure is difficult to read since the lines are too long.	Force Figure 4 to be a full-page width float that follows section 6.2.3.3		A	C	
38	Camp, Michael	7.1	29	50	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
39	Camp, Michael	7.2	30	48	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
40	Camp, Michael	7.2	30	51	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
41	Camp, Michael	7.2	31	8	e	N	Table 1 - Inconsistent border style	Make bottom border a heavier line weight		A	C	
42	Camp, Michael	7.2	31	16	e	N	Table 2 - Inconsistent border style	Make bottom border a heavier line weight		A	C	
43	Camp, Michael	7.3	31	29	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
44	Camp, Michael	7.3	32	5	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
45	Camp, Michael	7.3	32	12	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
46	Camp, Michael	7.6	39	3	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
47	Gilb, James	7.6	39	10	e	N	ETC is used but not included in the acronym definitions	Add ETC to the acronym definitions.		A	C	
48	Gilb, James	8.1	41	50	e	N	The sentence says "The current document describes ..." it should be "This clause describes ..."	Change sentence as indicated		A	C	
49	Gilb, James	8.5	59	45-46	e	N	"... reasonable error-free ..." should be "... reasonably error-free ..."	Change as indicated		A	C	
50	Gilb, James	8.5	59	47-48	e	N	Text in bold format where it should be in normal text format. This formatting occurs at various places in this clause and should be changed wherever it occurs.	Remove bold formatting here and throughout the clause to match the rest of the standard.		A	C	
51	Gilb, James	8.6	68	51-52	e	N	Semicolon in sentence "... by the ACL link; however, they can ..." should be a comma	Change semicolon to comma *James Gilb writes: "I agree with the rejection for two of my comments, the ones numbered 83 [[51]] (8.6, p. 68, lines 51-52) and 106 [[328]] (8.10.6.2, p. 85 line 50)"*		R	Z	Semicolon is correct in this sentence.
52	Camp, Michael	8.7	69	50	e	N	Phrase "An exception forms"	Suggested text: " An exception exists when forming"		A	C	
53	Camp, Michael	8.8	70	30	e	N	Cross-references to subclauses 8.1 and 8.2 are incorrect.	Should refer to subclauses 8.8.1 and 8.8.2		A	C	
54	Roberts, Rick	9.1	152	18	e		page 152, line 18 ... what does <Blue> mean? Should this be removed?			A	C	
55	Roberts, Rick	9.4	186	7	e		page 186, figure 5 ... text has spelling error (oofset --> offset)			A	C	
56	Gilb, James	10	6	N/A	e	N	The page numbering resets at clause 10 to page 6 (should be continuous and anyway should be odd for right side pages)	Fix page numbering.		A	C	
57	Roberts, Rick	10	6		e		How come clause 10 is given as page 6?			A	C	
58	Roberts, Rick	10	6		e		The numbering on clause 10 should be 10.1 ... not 10.0.1			A	C	
59	Roberts, Rick	10	11		e		Clause 10, page 11 ... word "Erratum" appears ... in fact this appears all over clause 10			A	C	
60	Roberts, Rick	10.0.1			e		In clause 10.0.1, we have a font change under Figure 2			A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
61	Roberts, Rick	10.0.1			e		In clause 10.0.1, in the text under Figure 2 is a referral to Figure 3 on page 7. There are two page 7 in this document ... very confusing!			A	C	
62	Roberts, Rick	12.1.1	246	4	e		Figure 138 in section 12 (Service Access Point) has a spelling error ... Servide --> Service			A	C	
63	Gilb, James	1-Annex H	All Even	page #	e	N	The even page numbers (i.e. the left page master) has a different font thant the odd side page numbers.	Change even page number font to match odd page number font. 802.11 appears to be Times Roman (the even page number format) rather than Helvetica (the odd page number format)		A	C	
64	Gilb, James	1-Annex H	all	page #	e	N	The page numbers appear on the wrong side of the pages (I suspect left and right pages are messed up).	Change master pages and master page usage so that odd page numbers appear on the right hand side of the right hand pages.		A	C	IEEE / SA will be modifying this before Sponsor Ballot
65	Watanabe, Fujio	2.4.4	4	16	e	n	2000 isa wrong year	2001 instead of 200		A	C	
66	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.1.1	21	34	e		For example, a PDA must…	For example, a communications-enabled PDA must.…		A	C	
67	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.1.1	21	40	e		a park, industrial plants. The...	a park, industrial plants, and so on. The...		A	C	
68	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.1.1	21	48	e		his/her possession, in his/her vicinity...	his/her possession, or in his/her vicinity...		A	C	
69	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.1.2.2	23	4	e		LAN (Ethrenet), their primary objective...	LAN (Ethrenet), a WLAN's primary objective...		A	C	
70	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.2.2	26	3->8	e		Figure 2 shows … upper layer data.	Figure 2 shows the general format of a single-slot, payload-bearing packet transmitted over-the-air in a Bluetooth WPAN. The packet comprises of an ...... which carries upper layer data. Due to the small size of the packet, large upper-layer packets need to be segmented prior to transmission over the air. Detailed information about this packet format can be found in clause 8.		A	C	2001 Date: Wed, 4 Apr 2001 09:45:28 -0400 From: Chatschik Bisdikian <bisdik@us.ibm.com> To: "Gifford, Ian C." <giffordi@world.std.com> Subject: Re: Comment No 70? Ian, It took me some time to understand my comment, but here is what I can recollect. My comment refers to last paragraph of clause 6.2.2 on page 39 of D0.8. In the order with which the sentences are written, there may be a confusion to the reader as the 2nd sentence refers to segmenting upper layer packets. This statement and the way Fig.2 is shown, one may think that the contents of the slot intself is the upper layer data that is segmented later on. In my suggestion, I've reversed the order of sentences in this last paragraph of clause 6.2.2 to read somewhat clearer. I repeat the full paragraph here as I suggested it. ".... Figure 2 shows the general format of a single-slot, payload-bearing packet transmitted over-the-air in a Bluetooth WPAN. The packet comprises
71	Camp, Michael	6.2.2	25	3	e	N	Phrase "power-cautious"	Reword: "power-conscious"		A	C	
72	Camp, Michael	6.2.2	25	11	e	N	Phrase "ad hoc" should be in italics	Format: "ad hoc" in italics		A	C	
73	Camp, Michael	6.2.2	25	51	e	N	Inverted sentence structure	Reword: "The jitter for voice traffic is kept low by using small transmission slots.		A	C	
74	Camp, Michael	6.2.2	26	7	e	N	Phrase "managing the traffic on the packet"	Reword: " managing the transmission of the packet"		A	C	
75	Ling, Stanley	6.2.2	25	20	e	y	Each packet is not transmitted on a different hop frequency but a different center or carrier frequency. A hop frequency is the frequency which the system hops (this does not change).	Change the wording "different hop frequency" to "different center frequency"		A	C	Changed text to "different frequency in the hopping sequence"
76	Camp, Michael	7.3.1	32	20	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
77	Gilb, James	7.3.1	32	18	e	N	BT is not defined and could be confused with Bluetooth	Suggest adding wording in the paragraph, such as "the bandwidth-bit period product, BT, is equal to 0.5"		A	C	
78	Gilb, James	7.3.1	32	50	e	N	1 Ms/s can be confused, should be either 1 Mbaud or 1 Msymbol/s	Change "1 Ms/s" to "1 Mbaud"		A	C	Msymbol/s
79	Ling, Stanley	7.3.1	32	50	e	y	Use consistent, and correct, units for the symbol rate. This should be Mbaud, or Msym/s, or Msymbols/s, but not Ms/s. Ms/s can also mean Mega-samples per second.	Change Ms/s to Msymbols/s and be consistent throughout the document.		A	C	Msymbol/s
80	Camp, Michael	7.3.1.2	33	14	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
81	Camp, Michael	7.3.2.2	33	44	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
82	Gilb, James	7.3.2.2	34	3	e	N	No space before "(dBm)" in table headers	Add space		A	C	
83	Camp, Michael	7.3.3	33	53	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
84	Camp, Michael	7.3.3	33	54	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
85	Camp, Michael	7.4.2	34	46	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
86	Camp, Michael	7.4.2	34	47	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
87	Camp, Michael	7.4.2	34	48	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
88	Camp, Michael	7.4.3	35	32	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
89	Camp, Michael	7.4.4	35	52	e	N	Formatting: Page break should fall before subclause	Keep Clause header with text that follows.		A	C	
90	Camp, Michael	7.4.4	36	4	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
91	Camp, Michael	7.4.6	36	16	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
92	Camp, Michael	7.4.6	36	17	e	N	Spurious colon at end of sentence	Remove colon		A	C	
93	Camp, Michael	7.4.7	37	2	e	N	Editing tags left in text: "[XREF]"	Remove tags		A	C	
94	Camp, Michael	7.4.8	37	29	e	N	Unnecessary underline in cross-reference	Remove underline		A	C	
95	Camp, Michael	7.4.8	37	29	e	N	Bad cross-reference, page number 1084 does not exist.	Fix cross-reference		A	C	
96	Camp, Michael	7.5.1.1	37	42	e	N	Text refers to "test report", no internal or external document reference.	Add internal or external document reference.		A	C	MTC: This is an external cross-reference that needs to be resolved. ICG: I moved the sentence to a note which implies informative i.e., "Note: The actual value during the test shall be recorded in the test report."; until such time that we can resolve what "...the test report." is.
97	Gilb, James	8.10.6.2	85	50	e	N	"beginnings" should be "beginning" since there is only one interval considered	Change as indicated		R	C	There are two items: "beginnings" is appropriate
98	Camp, Michael	8.10.6.3	86	39	e	N	Grammar: "It will in fact transmit also"	Change to: "It will also transmit"		A	C	
99	Camp, Michael	8.10.6.3	87	51	e	N	Typo: "page train is independent on the presence"	Change to: "page train is independent of the presence"		A	C	
100	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	86	33	e	N	"With the CLKE of the slave's ..." should be "With the CLKE estimate of the slave's ..."	Change as indicated		R	C	CLKE means Clock Estimate: this would have resulted in a duplication of the term
101	Camp, Michael	8.10.6.4.1	90	33	e	N	Phrase: "can already arrive"	Change to: "can arrive"		A	C	
102	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	91	6	e	N	No space between "... respectively." and "See Section ..."	Add space		A	C	
103	Camp, Michael	8.10.6.4.2	91	37	e	N	First two sentences of paragraph are repeated from the paragraph above.	Delete first two sentences of paragraph starting on line 37.		A	C	
104	Camp, Michael	8.10.7.3	92	25	e	N	Verb tense:"has been assumed that the HV3 packet are used"	Change to: "has been assumed that the HV3 packet is used"		A	C	
105	Camp, Michael	8.10.7.4	94	4	e	N	Verb tense: "a slave on average responses 4 times"	Change to : "A slave, on average, responds four times"		A	C	
106	Roberts, Rick	8.13.2.1	121	2	e		On page 121 of section 8.13.2.1, change the phrase "X-raying" to "Xoring"			A	C	
107	Roberts, Rick	8.14.2.1	126	11	e		Page 126, line 11 needs excess carriage return removed			A	C	
108	Gilb, James	8.2.1	43	7	e	N	Improper use of semicolon in "... the master; the phase ..."	Change to "... the master. The phase"		A	C	
109	Camp, Michael	8.4.1	45	52	e	N	Typo: "linkcontroller" should read "link controller"	Add space in text.		A	C	
110	Gilb, James	8.4.1	45	45	e	N	The sentence reference the "Baseband Specification," which is the current clause, and has italics that is not appropriate	Remove the italics and change "the Baseband Specification" to "this clause"		A	C	
111	Gilb, James	8.4.1	45	51	e	N	No space in "linkcontroller"	Either add space between "link" and "controller" or hyphenate the word.		A	C	
112	Camp, Michael	8.4.4	50	7	e	N	Awkward phrase: "up to now"	Delete phrase		A	C	
113	Camp, Michael	8.4.4	50	18	e	N	Awkward phrase: "so far"	Delete phrase		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) *LB8 Reply Comment.*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
114	Camp, Michael	8.4.4.1	51	3	e	N	Entire subclause is phrased awkwardly.	Suggested text: "There are five packet types defined which are independent of the underlying physical link type. Additionally, the ID packet type is defined which is used in the paging and inquiry procedures, described later in this document. These packet types are defined as follows.		A	C	
115	Camp, Michael	8.4.4.1.4	51	40	e	N	Phrase: "This clock information is updated before each transmission. The retransmission of the FHS payload is thus somewhat different from the retransmission of ordinary data payloads where the same payload is used for each retransmission."	Suggested Text: "Subsequent transmissions of the FHS packet contain updated clock information. Each transmission always contains the most recent native clock data from the Bluetooth node.		A	C	
116	Camp, Michael	8.4.4.1.4	52	32	e	N	External document reference missing "Bluetoooth Assigned Numbers"	Add external document reference.		A	C	
117	Camp, Michael	8.4.4.2	53	54	e	N	Phrase: "Up to now, three pure SCO packets have been defined."	Suggested Text: "In previous clauses, three SCO packet types were defined."		A	C	
118	Camp, Michael	8.4.4.2.4	54	40	e	N	Grammar: "The voice and data fields are treated completely separate."	"The voice and data fields are treated separately."		A	C	
119	Camp, Michael	8.4.5.2	56	30	e	N	Inappropriate pluralization: "2-bytes"	Reword: "2-byte"		A	C	
120	Camp, Michael	8.4.5.2	56	35	e	N	Inappropriate pluralization: "2-bytes"	Reword: "2-byte"		A	C	
121	Camp, Michael	8.4.5.2	57	16	e	N	Text should indicate that codes are binary representations	Use notation of form: "01b", or whatever form is approved in IEEE.			C	MTC: Need a recommendation from IEEE publications on styles for non-base 10 numbers. Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
122	Camp, Michael	8.4.5.2	57	30	e	N	"LMP_features_res" message needs cross reference.	Refer to subclause 9.3.11 "Supported Features"		A	C	
123	Gilb, James	8.4.5.2	57	44	e	N	No space in "payloadlength"	Change to "payload length"		A	C	
124	Gilb, James	8.4.5.2	57	44	e	N	Extra space at the end of the line ending with "and continue-fragment"	Fix extra space (probably extra carriage return in text)		A	C	
125	Gilb, James	8.4.5.2	58	25-26	e	N	Text in bold format where it should be in normal text format	Remove bold formatting to match the rest of the clause.		A	C	
126	Gilb, James	8.5.3.2	63	19	e	N	No space between "... packet.The described ..."	Change to "... packet. The described ..."		A	C	
127	Camp, Michael	8.5.3.5	65	4	e	N	Graphic: Figure 19 text "roadcast packets"	Should read "Broadcast packets"		A	C	
128	Cypher, David	8.5.3.5	65	5	e		Misspelling of broadcast	Add "B" in front of "roadcast paclets"		A	C	
129	Gilb, James	8.5.3.5	64	29	e	N	Extra space around the hyphen in "time - critical"	Remove space, change to "time-critical"		A	C	
130	Roberts, Rick	8.5.3.5	65	5	e		Figure 19 has a spelling error on the figure			A	C	
131	Camp, Michael	8.5.4	65	49	e	N	Graphic: Caption for Figure 20 is above graphic, and separated by a page break.	Captions should appear below the associated gaphic, and stay on the same page.		A	C	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
132	Camp, Michael	8.5.4	66	11	e	N	80% of page is blank	Move figures 21 and 22 to page 66		A	C	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
133	Roberts, Rick	8.5.4	65	50	e		Put the caption for figure 20 and the figure on the same page.			A	C	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
134	Roberts, Rick	8.5.4	66	1	e		Figure 20 is an orphan figure			A	C	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
135	Gilb, James	8.6.1	69	3	e	N	In "The LC control channel ..." the word control is redundant (it is the C in LC).	Remove the word "control"		A	C	
136	Gilb, James	8.6.5	69	33-35	e	N	Extra space after paragraph and before 8.7	Remove extra space		A	C	
137	Gilb, James	8.9.1	76	16	e	N	"behaviour" it the English spelling, the proper American spelling is "behavior".	Change spelling as indicated		R	C	IEEE creates international standards. It is in our dictionary
138	Gilb, James	8.9.3	77	44	e	N	Unnecessary use of bold for the states, it distracts from the description in this and other paragraphs.	Remove the bold formatting of the transceiver states in this clause.		A	C	
139	Camp, Michael	8.9.6	79	28	e	N	Phrase "according the RX/TX timing"	Should read "according to the RX/TX timing"		A	C	
140	Camp, Michael	8.9.6	79	35	e	N	Phrase "message sent secondly in the master-to-slave slot"	Should read "message sent on the second frequency of the preceding master-to-slave slot"		A	C	
141	Camp, Michael	8.9.6	81	2	e	N	The second sentence in the paragraph is not clear.	Suggested wording: "The response sent 625us after the start of the FHS packet acknowledges receipt of the FHS.		A	C	
142	Camp, Michael	8.9.7	81	13	e	N	Phrase "exception is found in the access window"	Change to: "exception is the access window"		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
143	Cypher, David	9.3.18	177	54	e		Wrong section number.	Replace with 7.3		A	C	
144	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	267	5	e	y	Table18 is incorrect but it depends on the table number	In the current D0.8, Table 6 instead of Table 18		A	C	
145	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	267	30	e	y	Table 24 is incorrect in D0.8	Table 12		A	C	
146	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	267	33	e	y	Table 24 is incorrect in D0.8	Table 12		A	C	
147	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	267	35	e	y	Table 24 is incorrect in D0.8	Table 12		A	C	
148	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	267	50	e	y	Table 25 is incorrect in D0.8	Table 13		A	C	
149	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	267	52	e	y	Table 25 is incorrect in D0.8	Table 13		A	C	
150	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	268	3	e	y	Table 25 is incorrect in D0.8	Table 13		A	C	
151	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.4	268	4	e	n	Note:… there is no space between Table and this statement.	insert space		A	C	
152	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.11	279	53	e	y	O (option) is changed to C.1	C.1 instead of O		A	C	
153	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	273	52	e	y	C.3 is a wrong number	C.3 -> C.2		A	C	
154	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	273	53	e	y	C.4 is a wrong number	C.4 -> C.3		A	C	
155	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	273	54	e	y	C.5 is a wrong number	C.5 -> C.4		A	C	
156	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	274	1	e	y	C.6 is a wrong number	C.6 -> C.5		A	C	
157	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	274	2	e	y	C.7 is a wrong number	C.7 -> C.6		A	C	
158	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	274	2	e	n	delete space between ":" and "Mandatory"			A	C	
159	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.1	285	44	e	N	A:46/2 ":" can be "."	A.46/2		A	C	
160	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.1	285	45	e	N	A:46/2 or A:46/3 ":" can be "."	A.46/2 or A.46/3		A	C	
161	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.1	285	46	e	N	A:46/5 ":" can be "."	A.46/5		A	C	
162	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.1	285	44	e	y	THEN M, ELSE O is not good word	then mandatory, else optional		A	C	
163	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.1	285	45	e	y	THEN M, ELSE O is not good word	then mandatory, else optional		A	C	
164	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.2	286	25	e	N	A:47/4 , A:47/5, A:47/6 ":" can be "."	A.47/4, A.47/5, A.47/6		A	C	
165	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.2	286	26	e	N	A:47/6 ":" can be "."	A.47/6		A	C	
166	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.2	286	27	e	N	A:47/4 , A:47/5, A:47/6 ":" can be "."	A.47/4, A.47/5, A.47/6		A	C	
167	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.2	286	25	e	y	THEN M, ELSE O is not good word	then mandatory, else optional		A	C	
168	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.2	286	26	e	y	THEN M, ELSE O is not good word	then mandatory, else optional		A	C	
169	Gilb, James	C.2.2.2	837	48	e	N	The paragraph says "In the table above" but it should be a figure reference.	Change text to say "In figure C.1"		A	C	
170	Camp, Michael	FM	iii	46	e	N	Acronym: "SIG" not defined	Use full text : Special Interest Group		A	C	
171	Camp, Michael	Footer	All	N/A	e	N	Page numbers on facing page footers are inconsistent. Left hand pages are Helvetica/Arial and right pages are Times fonts	Re-format footers to use consistent fonts in footer		A	C	
172	Camp, Michael	Front Matter	i	23	e	N	Sentence fragment: "; which is an industry specification"	Reword: "; Bluetooth is an industry specification"		A	C	
173	Gilb, James	G.3.3	989	45	e	N	the text "Encryption_Mode = 1 /*point-to-point/" doesn't make sense	Delete the text "/*point-to-point/"		A	C	
174	Gilb, James	Introduction	xiii	54	e	N	The introduction ends on an odd page, should end on on an even page	Delete page xiii		A	C	Editor Note: ICG I hope the D0.9.1 production catches this.
175	Gilb, James	TOC	x-xii		e	N	The spacing in the TOC between subsections of the annexes is not consistent with the spacing of the subsections of the clauses.	Change the TOC format to fix the spacing of the subsections of the annexes.		A	C	Editor Note: ICG I hope the D0.9.1 production catches this.
176	Gilb, James	1.3	1	46-48	E	Y	The terms listed are not synonymous. A WPAN is a wireless connection whereas the Bluetooth Foundation specification is a specification, not a wireless connection.	Delete the words "Bluetooth Foundation specification" or change it to "Bluetooth piconet"		A	C	Used the word "technology" instead of the suggested "piconet" for semantic reasons.
177	Gilb, James	3	5	32	E	N	The 802.15.1 hop rate is nominally 1600 hops/s, it actually ranges from 320 to 3200 hops/s depending on its mode.	Change "occur at a hop rate of 1600 hops/s" to "occur at a nominal hop rate of 1600 hops/s"		A	C	
178	Gilb, James	3	7	47-48	E	N	There is some extra commentary that is not clear and not needed for the definition, beginning with "(active is not …"	Delete the clause and sentence that begin with "(active is not …"		A	C	
179	Gilb, James	3	7	53-54	E	N	Sentence fragment "Connection between devices"	Change to a complete sentence, e.g. "Also a connection between devices." or delete.		A	C	
180	Gilb, James	3	8	45	E	N	This is a re-definition of 3.57. 3.57 has a better description than 3.61	Either delete definition 3.61 or merge the information with 3.57		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Commenter Name:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
181	Ling, Stanley	6.2	24	8	E	Y	By defining the term "WPAN" as a WPAN that utilizes the Bluetooth technology, there will be confusion caused between non-Bluetooth technology WPANs (I.e., 802.15.3). A WPAN is a type of network (I.e., Wireless Personal Area Network) and does not define the type of technology used, whether it is GFSK, QAM, OFDM, etc.	Use the term WPAN to define any Wireless Personal Area Network technology. Use the terms Bluetooth WPAN or 802.15.1 WPAN to define WPANS using the Bluetooth wireless technology.		R	C	Clause 1.3 defines the usae of the term WPAN within the document.
182	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.3	27	14	E		…protocols as identified in Figure 4. The rest of this subclause…	…protocols as identified in Figure 1. However, for completeness, the rest of this subclause….		A	C	
183	Gilb, James	6.3	27	14	E	N	Figure 4 is referenced, but it should be Figure 5. Also, a new paragraph should be started following the reference.	Change "Figure 4" to "Figure 5" and start a new paragraph with the sentence "The rest of this subclause ..."		A	C	Editor Note: ICG I used Comment 182 vs. 183
184	Gilb, James	7.1	29 and following	51	E	Y	Extra text "[XREF]" for section cross-references and "[XREF]<BLUE>" for table cross-references	Delete "[XREF]" and "[XREF]<BLUE>" in all occurances. Likely this can be done by modifying the cross-reference definition and applying it to the whole document in frame.		A	C	
185	Gilb, James	7.1	29	52-54	E	N	The sentence refers to the draft standard as a specification and the regulatory documents as standards	Change "specification" to "standard" and "standard" to "regulatory", check for other occurrences of specification in the draft standard.		A	C	Editor Note: ICG The Comment Author should read the Title of the 802.15.3 Draft and he should note that SPECIFICATION also appears :)
186	Gilb, James	7.2	30	43	E	Y	The standard refers to Bluetooth rather than 802.15.1. While these are said to be synonymous in the introduction, the IEEE designation should be used throughout unless something is specifically Bluetooth and **not** 802.15.1	Change "Bluetooth" to 802.15.1 at this location and throughout the standard except where the reference is to Bluetooth and not 802.15.1.		R	C	Clauses 1 and 6 set forth the disclaimer about the nomenclature. We have determined that it is best to leave the term "Bluetooth" intact in the Normative sections so that one-to-one correspondence can be more easily maintained.
187	Gilb, James	7.4	34	28	E	Y	The paragraph beginning with "To measure ..." describes MAC, not PHY functionality and does not belong in this section. In addition, a loopback facility is not required for BER measurments in general, it is simply that BSIG has chosen this method.	Delete the paragraph		R	C	We have determined that it is best to leave the structure of the Bluetooth-derived intact in the Normative sections so that one-to-one correspondence can be more easily maintained. We agree it would have been best to have this text elsewhere in the document, but lacking an appropriate target location, we cannot do so. We do not believe that the presence this paragraph inhibits proper interpretation of the Standard.
188	Gilb, James	8	47ff	various	E	Y	The table format in this clause is not consistent with the rest of the document.	Change the table formats to be consistent with the rest of the standard.		A	C	
189	Gilb, James	8.1	41	32ff	E	Y	The section refers to Bluetooth systems when it should refer to 802.15.1 systems	Change Bluetooth to 802.15.1 throughout the clause except where Bluetooth specific items are being referred to.		R	C	Clauses 1 and 6 set forth the disclaimer about the nomenclature. We have determined that it is best to leave the term "Bluetooth" intact in the Normative sections so that one-to-one correspondence can be more easily maintained.
190	Gilb, James	8.1	41	49	E	Y	The cross reference to the Physical layer section does not include a clause number or page number	Change cross references through out this clause to include either the clause number, the page number or preferrably both.		A	C	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this. Does not need to be sent to BSIG Errata DB.
191	Gilb, James	8.6	68	50-52	E	Y	Three errors, the sentence ends with "is carried by the SCO link only;" which should end in a period. Then, there is a carriage return (or something) such that the line is not completed and then the next sentence "the UA and UI .." does not begin with a capital.	Change to "... is carried by the SCO link only. The UA and UI ..." and fix the problem with the justification.		A	C	
192	Cypher, David	12.3	250	42	E		If Figure 141 is correct, then where is figure 140. Possible numbering problem or missing figure	No suggestion until question is answered.		A	C	
193	Cypher, David	10.0.48	58	4	E		Naming does not match that listed in table 30.	Change BD_ADDR_List to BD_ADDR_Lst.		A	C	
194	Cypher, David	10.0.48	58	8 through 10	E		Current value indicates 6 octets, however the type is a pointer. Since a pointer is implementation dependent, it should not be indicated how many octets to use.	Value should be N/A since it is a pointer		A	C	Editor Note: ICG removed "0xXXXXXXXXXXX" from the value cell in the "Table"and replaced w/ N/A. Is this what DavidC wanted?
195	Cypher, David	11.2.2	70	3	E		Is this line an editor's note?	Delete it if it is OR correct punctuation		A	C	
196	Cypher, David	12.3.2	255&256	various	E		The Error codes should be deleted, as they are not SAP primitives.	Delete Error codes. If not, then the list should be updated to include the new add values.		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Commenter Name:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	Comment Type:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) *LB8 Reply Comment.*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
197	Bisdikian, Chatschik	6.2.1	24	27	E		As shown in Figure 3, the...	As shown in Figure 1, the...		A	C	
198	Gilb, James	6.3.1	28	5	E	Y	The Bluetooth specification is not open, only 9 companies have the power to change any part of the specification or its qualification. The free distribution of the document does not make it open.	Remove the words "open and"		A	C	
199	Gilb, James	7.3.2.1	33	16	E	Y	The sentence beginning with "In addition to the FCC ..." is confusing and does not correctly state what is intended	Change this sentence to the one in BT v1.1 on page 9, line 133 that begins with "In addition to the FCC ..."		A	C	
200	Ling, Stanley	7.3.2.1	33	16	E	y	This clauses places an FCC regulation on the standard. The FCC is a United States regulatory agency and should not define the specifications for an international standard.	Either add the statement to this section as criteria for US operation, such as "In the US, the spectrum must comply with FCC …", or remove the reference to FCC regulations and make this part of the standard.		R	C	It is upto the implementor to abide by local (point of sale) regulatory guidelines. The reference to the FCC is a guideline, and does not supercede local regulations.
201	Gilb, James	7.3.2.2	33	44	E	Y	The sentence "The power should ..." is not clear since it does not reference the requirements	Add another sentence that clarifies that Table 5 contains the requirements, e.g. "The out-of-band emissions shall conform to the requirements given in Table 5."		A	C	
202	Gilb, James	7.3.3	33	49	E	Y	Fc is not defined.	Change "from Fc" to "from the required channel center frequency" or define Fc.		A	C	
203	Ling, Stanley	7.3.3	33	49	E	y	For radio frequency tolerance, add the term "maximum" when defining the tolerance	"the transmitted initial center frequency accuracy must be +/- 75 kHz maximum from fc"		A	C	
204	Gilb, James	8.10.3	82	50-54	E	Y	There is no reason to indicate that a crystal oscillator is used for timing reference as this is implementation dependent and not relevant to the link control. Likewise, the LPO is not required, it could be an HPO (high power oscillator).	Change "... native clock is driven by the reference crystal oscillator with a worst case ..." to "... native clock has a worst case ..." and change "... clock may be driven by a low power oscillator (LPO) with relaxed accuracy ..." to "... clock may have a relaxed accuracy ..."		A	C	Changed reference to "crystal" as suggested. Reference to LPO is associated with "MAY" and is therefore informative.
205	Gilb, James	8.10.3	82	50-54	E	Y	The clock accuracy requirement is repeated here instead of referencing one of the two other locations where it is defined (of course the definitions are different, so you can pick which ever one you want). Likewise the LPO accuracy is referenced here, but should be specified where the symbol accuracy is defined.	Change the listing of a +/- ppm number to a cross reference where the clock accuracy is defined.		R	C	Previous timing accuracy references refer to protocol interchanges. This referece is a suggestion about the hardware clock. These concepts are related, but not interchangable. The reference is therefor inappropriate.
206	Gilb, James	8.10.5	84	44	E	Y	The sentence refers to the "LPO" accuracy rather than providing a cross-reference to where the accuracy is defined.	Change "... running at the accuracy of the LPO (or better)." to "...running, potentially at a reduced accuracy as defined in ???."		R	C	
207	Gilb, James	8.10.6.1	85	11-13	E	Y	This paragraph is an unneccessary repeat of earlier information.	Delete paragraph as it does not add any useful information to the discussion.		R	C	This paragraph is in the introductory part of the clause. Information is repeated advisedly.
208	Gilb, James	8.10.6.2	85	25	E	Y	Tw page scan is referred to but there is not cross reference. Also, the minimum scan window is indicated in page frequencies rather than in time.	Provide a cross reference that says where Tw page scan is defined or define it in this paragraph in terms of us. This would preferrably be a table.		A	C	
209	Gilb, James	8.10.6.2	85	39	E	Y	There is an inconsistent use of all-caps for system states. The state of page scan, page, etc. are lower cased while STANDBY and CONNECTION are upper cased.	Change all state indications to either lower case or upper case.		A	U	We agree that it is preferable to maintain a consistent case on system attributes. We will submit an official Bluetooth erratum to call out this deficit. We do not believe that this problem will prevent the proper implementation of a system based on this Standard. ERRATA# 2144
210	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	86	41-42	E	Y	The information in the sentence "Since the page ... the synthesizer" has already been presented in this clause. In addition, this information is not relevant to the present discussion.	Delete the sentence.		A	C	The sentence is, indeed, parenthetical. The appropriate punctuation has been added.
211	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	86	42-43	E	Y	Change the sentence "... the receiver ... for ID packet." to "... the receiver that issued the page ... for the ID packet."	Change as indicated		R	C	There is no ambiguity in this sentence.
212	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	86	47	E	Y	The sentence "The synthesizer hop ..." is redundant, having been adequately adressed elsewhere.	Delete the sentence.		R	C	This information is provided for the convenience of the reader to improve readability.

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
213	Gilb, James	8.10.6.3	87	Table 13	E	Y	This table repeats some of the information from table 12.	Delete the column Npage from Table 12 and reference Table 12 here and Table 13 in the description for Table 12		R	C	These tables are different. Both are necessary.
214	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4	88	45	E	Y	The usage of page_scan here is not consistent with page scan and **page scan** elsewhere in this clause.	The best would be to use PAGE_SCAN throughout the clause (likewise for INQUIRY_SCAN and other states), otherwise page_scan without bold formatting should be used.		R	C	Term page_response does not refer to a state or sub-state.
215	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4	89	18-19	E	Y	Extra words and an imprecise description.	Change "... (= slave's device access code) sent by the master reaches the slave." to "... sent by the master is received by the slave."		A	C	The parenthetical part of the sentence is necessary to help the reader to understand the context. Removed '=', replaced with "in this case,". Replaced "reaches" with "is received by"
216	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	90	24-52	E	Y	This is the best definition of the page response state. Very little new information is given in 8.9.6 and the presentation in two different sections is confusing.	Delete section 8.9.6 and its accompanying figures (which are redundant), merge any missing ideas into section 8.10.6.4.1. Delete the sentence that begins "More details about the ..." on line 35.		R	C	8.9.6 Is a general description; it must preceed the subsequent usage explaination. The two sections, although related, they do not describe the same thing. One describes the use of the FHS packet, the other describes the behavior in that particular sub-state.
217	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	90	38	E	Y	The nomenclature for the timing parameter here, *pagerespTO* differs from earlier timing, e.g. Tw page scan.	Select one method (T_parameter is best) and keep it consistent throughout for all timing paramters (e.g. newconnectionTO). Link all of the usages of the word with cross references to where the numeric definition can be found.		A	U	We agree that it is preferable to maintain a consistent nomenclature. We will submit an official Bluetooth erratum to call out this deficit. We do not believe that this problem will prevent the proper implementation of a system based on this Standard. ERRATA# 2135
218	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	90	45	E	Y	"a FHS" should be "an FHS" here and throughout the clause (particularly on p 91, line 11, 8.10.6.4.2)	Change as indicated		A	C	
219	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	91	33-35	E	Y	The end of the paragraph beginning with "The channel hopping ..." is redundant, having been adequately explained earlier in the clause.	Delete the last three sentences.		A	C	[assume 8.6.4.2]
220	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.2	91	29	E	Y	Change "parameters so" to "parameters for" on line 29	Change as indicated		A	C	
221	Gilb, James	8.2.2	43	18	E	N	This sentence does not form a whole paragraph, is misleading (it does not clarify that they cannot transmit in just any slot or at the same time) and it is better explained in the next paragraph	Delete the sentence beginning with "In the time slots, ..."		A	C	
222	Gilb, James	8.2.2	43	31	E	Y	The sentence beginning with "If a packet occupies ..." repeats information from earlier in the paragraph.	Delete the sentence		R	C	Current paragraph makes sense the way it is and does not prevent the implementor of a system from creating interoperable devices.
223	Gilb, James	8.4.2.1	47	11	E	N	The sentence references the "BD address" which is an undefined acronym.	Change "BD address" to either "Bluetooth device address" or BD_ADDR (which is a defined acronym).		A	C	
224	Gilb, James	8.4.5.2	57	16-52	E	Y	The spacing between paragraphs on this page is incorrect (i.e. no spacing) (Actually, most of this discussion belongs somewhere else since it does not pertain to the packet structure, but rather the fragmentation and flow control of L2CAP messages)	Add spacing between the paragraphs. Also, if possible, move the information pertaining to fragmentation and flow control of L2CAP messages to a more appropriate locations.		A	C	
225	Gilb, James	8.5.3.1	61	26	E	Y	"ARQ bit" is used when it should be "ARQN bit"	Change as indicated		A	C	
226	Gilb, James	8.9.1	76	6-7	E	Y	The phrase "The master shall keep an exact ... of successive transmissions" is a repeat of the same information from page 75, lines 45-46. (There also isn't a space betweent the preceeding sentence and this one).	Delete the sentence since it is repetitious and only serves to confuse the reader.		A	C	We changed a different part of the paragraph, which effects the same result.

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
227	Gilb, James	8.9.2	76	23	E	Y	"Each RX and TX transmission is at a different hop frequency." does not clearly describe what is happening. A master TX and slave RX are at the same hop. For a given 802.15.1 device, it RX and TX are at a different hop frequency. In any event, this sentence and the sentence that follows are another repetition (not even the first) of this information.	Delete this sentence and the next one as they are repetitious, not clear and not relevant to the discussion in 8.9.2.		R	C	This paragraph talks about a single Bluetooth transceiver, thus RX and TX are implicitily on the same device.
228	Gilb, James	8.9.2	77	21-23	E	Y	The sentence "In figure 9.1 through 9.6 ... page response sequence frequencies" is in the wrong place (i.e. it discusses page hopping rather than connection) and refers to the wrong figure numbers.	Delete the sentence, it really confuses the discussion.		R	C	
229	Gilb, James	8.9.4	78	28-34	E	Y	Since the return from hold, park wake-up and sniff wake-up use the same search window, they should be described in the same section. The repeat of some (but not all) of the information in this subclause is confusing and incomplete in its description. (The capitalization in the title is wrong too and there is a space missing between sniff and modes in the first sentence, but the whole thing should be deleted anyway).	Delete 8.9.4 and add to 8.9.3 that the discussion applies to park and sniff modes wake-up.		R	C	The functions are defined seperatly to maintain focus of description. This discussion is appropriate within its context. Capital letter changes made.
230	Gilb, James	8.9.5	78	40	E	Y	The hop rate **is** increased, it is not optional (as indicated by the wording "can be"	Change "... hop rate can be increased ..." to "... hop rate is increased ..."		A	C	
231	Gilb, James	8.9.6	79	29	E	Y	The lost text from page 77 has found a home (see comment 90). There is no description of the differences between f(k) and f'(k) in this paragraph.	Move the sentence describing f(k) and f'(k), with corrected figure references, to this paragraph, possibly after the sentence ending "... the slave received." on line 29		R	C	The useage of these terms are defined earlier in the clause (see 8.9.2)
232	Gilb, James	8.9.6	79	34-40	E	Y	There are two hopping sequences used in the page/page response scenario, but the text in the paragraph only uses the term "hop frequency" without distinguising which sequence is used.	For each reference of "hop frequency" change it to to indicate if it is the "page hop frequency" or "page response hop frequency" as appropriate.		R	C	Terms f(k) and f'(k) are clearly defined and implicitly indicate the hopping sequence in use.
233	Gilb, James	8.9.6	79	23-40	E	Y	Inconsistent use of bold formatting with "FHS". No other packet in this clause is bold-faced (e.g. ID packet referenced earlier in the clause).	Remove bold formatting from "FHS" since it is confusing and detracts from the "first" and "secondly" bold formatting which does serve to clarify the discussion in this paragraph.		A	C	Edited FHS for consistency(I.e. bold), since FHS is tittle of subclause.
234	Gilb, James	8.9.7	81	5-38	E	Y	This subclause repeats information that has been mentioned many times before in the standard and adds absolutely no new information.	Delete the subclause, possibly moving the figure to an earlier subclause where this description first appears.		R	C	Repetition of this subclause is intentional as is stated in the first sentence.
235	Cypher, David	9.3.6.3	162	32	E		Section 8.14.2.2.2 Does not contain COF. What section does?	Correct reference number or remove bad reference.		A	C	
236	Watanabe, Fujio	A.3.3.1	263	51	E	N	Japan is missing	for USA, Japan and Europe (except France),		A	C	
237	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.11	279	53	E	y	Allow is changed	Allow -> Accept		A	C	Submit Bluetooth Errata -- Changed in original doc
238	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	42-50	E		Reference 9.3.17.6 does not exist. Is text missing or is there a numbering problem?	In no missing text, then reference is 9.3.17.5.		A	C	
239	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	29-33	E		Reference 9.3.17.3 does not contain supporting text. Is there a numbering problem?	Delete reference		A	C	
240	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	34-37	E		Reference 9.3.17.4 does not contain supporting text. Is there a numbering problem?	Change reference to 9.3.17.3		A	C	
241	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	38-41	E		Reference 9.3.17.5 does not contain supporting text. Is there a numbering problem?	Change reference to 9.3.17.4		A	C	
242	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	8	E	n	"C.3:Mandatory to support… " the statement is changed	C.3: If A.31/1(Request sniff mode) is supported, then mandatory to support.		R	C	
243	Cypher, David	B	all	all	E		All SDLs need to be updated according to the new version of this draft text.	Various		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) *LB8 Reply Comment.*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
244	Gilb, James	C	837ff	N/A	E	Y	The figure and table numbering in section C is incorrect, it runs A.1, B.1, C.1, etc. for both figures and tables	Fix figure and table numbering		A	C	
245	Gilb, James	C	858ff	31	E	N	The cross references in this section are in wrong font and emphasis and do not provide either clause numbers or pages. For example, the cross references in this section are "Baseband Specification" and "Link Manager Protocol"	Change cross references through out this clause to include either the clause number, the page number or preferrably both.		A	C	
246	Cypher, David	C.10.2	866	32	E		What are references [2] and [1]?	Add references		A	C	[1] corresponds to clause 8, [2] corresponds to clause 9.
247	Cypher, David	C.4.2.3.3	841	41	E		What is reference [1]?	Add reference		A	C	[1] corresponds to clause 8, [2] corresponds to clause 9.
248	Gilb, James	C.6	846	25	E	N	The note beginning "Note: support for LMP" does not make sense and there is a font and emphasis change in the middle"	Change the font and emphasis of "Link Manager" and change the text to be an appropriate cross reference adding a comma at the end.		A	C	
249	Cypher, David	C.6.2.2	849	13	E		What is reference [10]?	Add reference		A	C	
250	Gilb, James	C.7.1.1	850	1	E	N	Table 2 (note wrong numbering) has not title	Add title and fix numbering		A	C	
251	Gilb, James	C.7.1.1	850	15	E	N	The text "Link Manager Protocol" has the wrong font and emphasis and the wording does not make sense in the note	Replace the text with a proper cross reference, e.g. "... is mandatory (see section x.x.x on page xxx)"		A	C	
252	Gilb, James	D	870-871	1	E	Y	The table numbering and figure numbering in the annex are incorrect	Fix the figure and table numbering throughout the annex		A	C	
253	Gilb, James	D.1	868	16ff	E	N	The paging scheme 1 (or l) reference uses the wrong font and emphasis	Change the font and emphasis to match the rest of the paragraph on this line and all other occurances in the annex.		A	C	Editors Note: ICG chnaged the emphasis but left the 14pt font to assist the author's point.
254	Gilb, James	E	872	42	E	Y	The table numbering and figure numbering in the annex are incorrect. In addition, the table format in this annex (particularly the table title) is not consistent with the rest of the document.	Fix the figure and table numbering throughout the annex. Change the table format to be consistent with the rest of the standard		A	C	
255	Gilb, James	E	872ff	N/A	E	Y	The footer is justified incorrectly and the font and line spacing is not consistent with the rest of the document	Import the master pages from what ever document is being used to contain the correct formating of the standard.		A	C	
256	Cypher, David	F.1.1.6	887	8 through 10	E		Sentence does not make sense. What is it trying to say. Perhaps some missing text.	Add "so that it" before "… will work through …"		A	C	
257	Cypher, David	F.1.1.6	887	13	E		Default value is not in slots as per section description.	Put 20 seconds in () and add "32,000 slots"		A	C	
258	Bisdikian, Chatschik	front	iii	26	E		As of the pubilcation of this standard…..	As of the publication of this draft standard….		R	C	Editors Note: ICG I decided to NOT MAKE ANY CHANGES TO THIS PARAGRAPH.
259	Bisdikian, Chatschik	front	iii	27	E		Version 0.9	this (and other) version number from the current Bluetooth specifications/documents may have to be updated prior to the final publication of this standard		A	C	
260	Gilb, James	G	889ff	various	E	Y	The figure numbering is incorrect. In addition, the cross references to the figures are incorrect	Fix the figure numbering.		A	C	
261	Gilb, James	G.4.4	903	29	E	N	The reference to figure 4.4 is incorrect and points no-where.	Change to reference what is currently figure 0.13 (and fix the figure numbering)		A	C	
262	Gilb, James	G.7	917	3	E	N	Extra text "<BLUE>" in figure cross reference and in other cross references in the annex	Delete extra text in this and all other figure cross references.		A	C	
263	Gilb, James	H	922	all	E	Y	The bibliography is blank	Delete the annex or fill it with references.		A	C	Added IEEE Guide reference
264	Cypher, David	3.57	8	29-32	t	N	This definition is different from SCO in section 3.61 page 8 lines 45-47.	Either combine them or delete one		A	C	Changed to Editorial
265	Cypher, David	9.2	153	17	t	N	What is H2,1.1?	Clarify or correct what H2,1.1 is.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
266	Cypher, David	9.2	153	19	t	N	What is H2,1.1?	Clarify or correct what H2,1.1 is.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
267	Cypher, David	10.0.29	39	12	t	N	Length field missing	Insert "- Length = 0x004 or more octets"		A	C	Changed to Editorial
268	Cypher, David	11.2.10.1	198	10	t	N	Table 2 page 260. Is not correct reference.	Perhaps the correct reference is Table is 11.1 on Error codes		A	C	Changed to Editorial
269	Cypher, David	11.2.4.3	75	2	t	N	The Value indicates three X's (12 bits), yet the range values indicate four X's (16 bits).	Delete first 0(zero) before each hex value to align with the fact that there are only 12 bits to represent. Four Occurences		R	C	Changed to Editorial

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Commenter Name:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	Comment Type:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
270	Cypher, David	11.2.4.3	75	44	t	N	This section is talking about the Flags field which has two, two bit flags (I.e. four bits total)	Change 2 bits to 4 bits.		R	C	Changed to Editorial
271	Cypher, David	11.2.4.3	77	22	t	N	The Value indicates three X's (12 bits), yet the range values indicate four X's (16 bits).	Delete first 0(zero) before each hex value to align with the fact that there are only 12 bits to represent. Four Occurences		R	C	Changed to Editorial
272	Cypher, David	11.2.5.6	88	7	t	N	Missing code value, 0x29 under Value which is described under parameter description	Add missing code value, 0x29 under Value.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
273	Cypher, David	11.3.2.16	219	49	t	N	No values are defined	Change 0x00 to 0xXX.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
274	Cypher, David	12.2.1	248	47	t	N	There is no item c in figure 139. To what is it refering	Add labels to figure to match text		A	C	Changed to Editorial
275	Cypher, David	12.3.2	254	36-38	t		These commands should be removed to align with deletion from section 11.	These commands should be removed to align with deletion from section 11. NOTE: The Current SDLs list them but do nothing with them based on the same reason given in section 11.		R	C	Changed to Editorial
276	Kinney, Pat	6.1.2.2		16-	t	Y	Explanation of WPAN indicates that WPANs are master slave and so on. Terminology is not indicative of WPANs but of 802.15.1 WPANs	Change references to 802.15.1 WPANs		A	C	Master/Slave reference made specific to 802.15.1. Changed to Editorial
277	Ling, Stanley	6.2.2	25	17	t	y	The statement that a fast frequency hop transceiver combats interference is inaccurate and misleading. A FH transceiver avoids interference and averages the number of packets lost to interference, reducing the probability of every packet being destroyed, but does not do anything to "combat" it.	Change the term "combat" to "partially avoid" or "reduces the probability that all transmission is destroyed by interference".		A	C	Added parenthetical statement to conform to Remedy. Changed to Editorial
278	Cypher, David	8.10.9.3	104	1 through 52	t		Introduces step 1 through step 3 and later text step 4, but never clear what are the steps	Clearly mark where each of the steps are.		A	C	tms -- Inspect details of text and make recommendation Michael - I left the narrative intact, and removed the references to "steps". The text still makes sense (mostly).
279	Cypher, David	9.3.19	179	35	t		The Labels for the sequences 44, 45, & 46 do not appear to be correct. Label 44 should be deleted and replaced with label from 45. Label 45 should be deleted and replaced with label 46. Label 46 should be deleted and replaced with "Master notifies slave of quality of service"	Label 44 should be deleted and replaced with label from 45.		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2137)
280	Cypher, David	9.3.19	179	44	t		The Labels for the sequences 44, 45, & 46 do not appear to be correct. Label 44 should be deleted and replaced with lable from 45. Label 45 should be deleted and replaced with label 46. Label 46 should be deleted and replaced with "Master notifies slave of quality of service"	Label 45 should be deleted and replaced with label 46.		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2137)
281	Cypher, David	9.3.20.1	180	27	t		The Labels for the sequences 44, 45, & 46 do not appear to be correct. Label 44 should be deleted and replaced with lable from 45. Label 45 should be deleted and replaced with label 46. Label 46 should be deleted and replaced with "Master notifies slave of quality of service"	Label 46 should be deleted and replaced with "Master notifies slave of quality of service"		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2137)
282	Cypher, David	A.4.3.10	279	39	t		Text in parentheses indicates able to initiate SCO links, but there are two items initiating SCO (Master A.36/1and Slave A.36/2)	Add A.36/2 to Condition C.2		A	C	fw -- Contact Stan via email Editor Note: ICG added post Session #11 FAX from FW ", as Master"
283	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.10	279	18	t	y	C.2/12 is not a correct reference number	change to A.17/12		A	C	Changed to Editorial
284	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	34	t	y	Reference number in Item 3 should be "9.3.3.1, 9.3.3.2, 9.3.3.3".	insert "9.3.3.2"		A	C	Changed to Editorial
285	Cypher, David	A.4.3.6	273	42	t		Condition C.2 does not exist. Is it a numbering problem or missing text?	Fix numbering problem or add missing text.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
286	Cypher, David	A.4.3.6	274	2	t		Condition C.7 is not used. Is it a numbering problem or missing text?	Fix numbering problem or add missing text.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
287	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.6	273	30	t	y	C.2/3 is a wrong number	A.17/3 (Encryption..)		A	C	Changed to Editorial
288	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	276	34	t		C.3 should be replaced by M, since the condition is really the prerequisite.	Replaced C.3 with M.		A	C	Changed to Editorial

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
289	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	5	t		Change C.2 to M since the condition is really the prerequisite.	Change C.2 to M.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
290	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	30,36,& 40	t		Change C.1 to M since the condition is really the prerequisite.	Change C.1 to M.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
291	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	276	47	t	y	C.2/8 is not a correct reference number	change to A.17/8		A	C	Changed to Editorial
292	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	8	t	y	C.16/2 is not a correct reference number.	change to A.31/1		A	C	Changed to Editorial
293	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	20	t	y	C.2/9 is not a correct reference number	change to A.17/9		A	C	Changed to Editorial
294	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	29	t	y	Item 1: 9.3.17.3 is not correct	delete 9.3.17.3		A	C	Changed to Editorial
295	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	33	t	y	Item 2: 9.3.17.3 is not correct	delete 9.3.17.3		A	C	Changed to Editorial
296	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	34	t	y	Item 3: 9.3.17.4 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.3		A	C	Changed to Editorial
297	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	36	t	y	Item 4: 9.3.17.4 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.3		A	C	Changed to Editorial
298	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	38	t	y	Item 5: 9.3.17.5 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.4		A	C	Changed to Editorial
299	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	40	t	y	Item 6: 9.3.17.5 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.4		A	C	Changed to Editorial
300	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	42	t	y	Item 7: 9.3.17.6 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.5		A	C	Changed to Editorial
301	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	44	t	y	Item 8: 9.3.17.6 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.5		A	C	Changed to Editorial
302	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	45	t	y	Item 9: 9.3.17.6 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.5		A	C	Changed to Editorial
303	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	48	t	y	Item 10: 9.3.17.6 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.5		A	C	Changed to Editorial
304	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	49	t	y	Item 11: 9.3.17.6 is not correct	change to 9.3.17.5		A	C	Changed to Editorial
305	Cypher, David	A.5.3.1	282	36 & 43	t	N	The condition C.1 does not make sense to me. Since DH1 is marked as mandatory in Baseband PICS, why is this a condition based on whether DH1 are used or not?	Delete C.1 and replace with O (optional)		A	C	Changed to Editorial
306	Cypher, David	A.6.2.3	287	6	t	N	Condition C.1 is referenced in Table A.48, but no description of that C.1	Add description of condition		A	C	Changed to Editorial
307	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.3	287	5	t	y	C.1 is missing	Insert "C.1: If A.48/5 is supported, then at leaset one of A.48/1 or A.48/1 is M, ELSE O.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
308	Cypher, David	C.4.2.3.3	841	44	t		Are the examples missing? Text appears to let hanging the Word Examples: with no clearly identified examples, except those in the table 1	Add examples or remove the word.		A	C	Formatting problem
309	Cypher, David	D.2.4	871	53	t		The appears to be missing text, since The hopping …. Has no end	Add missing text		A	C	Ian to recover missing text
310	Cypher, David	F.1	886	8 through 14	t		Which one of these statements is correct? I think it is the first, not the second because not all timers are part of this annex.	Delete second paragraph.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
311	Cypher, David	G.0.0.2	898	1 through 40	t		Figure 0.6 and 0.7 are the same, yet they are supposed to represent different MSCs. Is an MSC missing or are these two operations truly the same?	Correct as appropriate based on the answer to the question		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2136)
312	Gilb, James	0	all		T	Y	A careful review of less than 10% of the document turned up an average of more than 1 error per page of the document. It is as if no one had even scanned the document before it was sent out. A quick scan of the document turns up at least 2 errors per clause. The multitude of errors in the document make a good technical evaluation very difficult. This document is not ready for review, let alone ready for sponsor ballot. It seems as if the document was sent out to make a deadline rather than being published when it was ready for review.	The document needs careful review and editing before it is sent for a working group ballot. After it is corrected for the numerous spelling, formatting and cross-reference errors, it would be ready for a technical evaluation by the working group. It its current form it is not ready for techical evaluation.		A	C	Changed to Editorial
313	"----duplicate of 312-----									A	C	duplicate 313
314	Cypher, David	3.56	8	26-27	T		The Definition of scatternet here does not agree with the one on page 103 line 15. Scatternet requires interpiconet communications.	Change this definition to the text from page 103. Or - Delete the text "or with-out" and the parentheses		A	C	Changed to Editorial

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
315	Gilb, James	7.3	32	13-14	T	Y	This paragraph states that all page and inquiry transmission should be done at less than +4 dBm TX power. However, this negates the ability of a piconet to operate at a class 1 power level since page and inquiry are required to set up all connections. If the master scales back his power for these critical link operations, then the effective range of the piconet will be reduced to be as if the master was only Power class 2 or 3.	Either delete the Power class 1 or state that Power class 1 devices shall use the Pmax in inquiry or page.		R	C	The word, should, indicates that this paragraph contains informative text, therefore it is not binding on other sections of the specification.
316	Gilb, James	8.1	41	37	T	Y	The sentence says "For full duplex transmission ..." but 802.15.1 is a half-duplex system. From Sklar, "Digital Communications, 2nd ed.," p. 315, Full-duplex is transmission in both directions simultaneously.	Change full-duplex to half-duplex		A	C	Editorial changes made to correct the shorthand used in this clause.
317	Gilb, James	8.7	69	38-40	T	Y	The whitening process does not minimize DC bias in a packet. In order to prevent DC bias, the message length must be expanded by the whitener, which it is not in 802.15.1. The whitener has no effect on the probability of achieving a certain DC bias based on random input data.	Remove the text that says "and to minimize DC bias in the packet."		A	C	Editorial changes made to correct the shorthand used in this clause.
318	Cypher, David	11.2.7.14	143	52	T	N	Current hex coding does not equal 5 seconds.	Change value 0x1FA0 to 0x1F40 to make 5 seconds.	Assumed Typo fixed submit errata (call KrisF) A -> 4 OR 5 -> 5.06 ERRATA# 2142 We received confirmation that the BSIG Section Owner concurs; edit pending.	A	C	Editor Note: ICG applied edit to D0.9.1.
319	Cypher, David	11.2.7.21	151	14&16	T		The range value 0x0012 does not agree with Range value 0.625 msec.	Either change 0x0012 to 0x0001 or change 0.625 to 11.25.	Did not fix Assumed Typo (call KrisF) x0012 -> x0001 OR 0.625 -> 11.25 ERRATA#2143	A	O	Editor Note: ICG sent 28Apr01 an opinion e-mail (see BSIG Errata Worksheet) to the BSIG Errata DB requesting reconsideration to first pass rejection of this comment by BSIG Section Owner.
320	Cypher, David	11.2.7.38	168	28	T		Is it obvious which connection type is referenced for no connection exists? I do NOT think so. Is it ACL or SCO? Meaning this command has to be run before any ACL is established -or- this command can be run after and ACL is established but before an SCO is established.	Add clarifying modifier ACL or SCO before "connection exists."		A	C	Changed to Editorial
321	Cypher, David	11.2.7.39	169	22	T		Is it obvious which connection type is referenced for no connection exists? I do NOT think so. Is it ACL or SCO? Meaning this command has to be run before any ACL is established -or- this command can be run after and ACL is established but before an SCO is established.	Add clarifying modifier ACL or SCO before "connection exists."		A	C	Changed to Editorial EDITOR: Delete text from corresponding HCI command listed in Table 11.1 (38-42) leave section numbers and add note: "Removed due to implemenetation specific nature."
322	Gilb, James	6.2.2	25	20	T	Y	The 802.15.1 system half duplex rather than full duplex since the transcievers operate either in transmit or reciever, but never both at the same time.	Change "full duplex" to "half duplex" (BTW: Clause 6 is a really good overview of 802.15.1)		A	C	Editorial changes made to correct the shorthand used in this clause.
323	Gilb, James	6.2.2	25	50	T	Y	The 64 kb/s is bi-directional but not full-duplex	Change "full duplex" to "bi-directional"		A	C	Editorial changes made to correct the shorthand used in this clause.

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
324	Gilb, James	7.3.1	32	20	T	Y	The symbol timing accuracy is specified, but it's measurement is not. How is it measured? Is it +/- 20 ppm of ideal zero crossings of a 0101 sequence? Is it measured at the peaks? is it +/- 20 ppm of the 1 Mbaud rate? Note that the definition of timing later in the standard (section 8.9) specifies that the +/- 20 ppm is relative to 625 us rather than the symbol rate of 1 us. This is almost 3 orders of magnitude difference in the meaning of the timing accuracy.	Provide a defined method to measure the accuracy of the symbol timing and insure that it matches with the definition in section 8.9.		R	C	The comment and the suggested remedy are not consistent. The symbol timing accuracy & the slot timing accuracy are well defined but unrelated. The standard does not recommend measurement methods.
325	Gilb, James	7.3.2.1	33	29	T	Y	The -20 dBc requirement is for frequency offsets greater than +/- 550 kHz	Change "+/- 550 kHz" to "> +/- 550 kHz"		R	C	The preceding text specifies a 100 KHz band around the stated frequency offset.
326	Gilb, James	7.3.3	34	21	T	Y	The maximum drift rate is not well defined. In an FSK system, the frequency is, by definition, always changing. The center frequency can only be inferred by observing a number of symbols and cannot be calculated instantaneously.	Provide a well defined method to measure the maximum drift rate or remove the requirement from the standard.		R	C	This clause does not attempt to set test specifications
327	Gilb, James	7.4.8	37	28	T	Y	The reference "(see Pseudo_Random Sequence, on page 1084)" is undefined. There is no page 1084 (due to the page numbering problem) and a text search of the PDF reveals no other occurances of that phrase. A search for pseudo reveals that the proper reference is on page 875, E.2.1.2. Also the PRBS-15 is undefined	Correct the reference for PRBS-9 and add a reference for PRBS-15.		A	C	Changed to Editorial. There is no other usage for PRBS-15 (or PRBS 15); the term now cross references to the Clause 2 ITU-T O.150 document which does contain the definition.
328	Gilb, James	8.10.6.2	85	47-48	T	Y	The scan windows should be required, not recommended. As it is, Bluetooth is very slow in responding to new devices, allowing devices to use smaller scan windows would make it much worse. Furthermore, it has not been shown that a smaller scan window will still allow devices to find each other. (The first page trains had a lock up condition that only came out under review. Shorter scan windows have not been analyzed).	Change recommended to required. James Gilb writes: "I agree with the rejection for two of my comments, the ones numbered 83 [[51]] (8.6, p. 68, lines 51-52) and 106 [[328]] (8.10.6.2, p. 85 line 50)"		R	Z	The text should remain as is. The choice of the page scan window size is up to the implementation, and is not appropriate to be included in the standard. The existing text makes a recommendation, which the implementer may or may not use. The end result affects the performance of the implementation, not the interoperability.
329	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.1	90	43	T	Y	Is CLKN restarted when the slave is listening for the FHS packet.	This needs to be clarified with text at the end of the paragraph ending on line 43.		R	C	CLKN is the native clock and is not frozen. The values in CLKN16-12 are frozen so that they are fixed when calculating the hop frequencies.
330	Gilb, James	8.10.6.4.2	91	27	T	Y	Here it seems that CLKN is restarted, but it is not clear when.	Clarify when CLKN is restarted, what is state and synchronize with explanation in section 8.10.6.4.1 (see comment 118)		R	C	CLKN is the native clock and is not stopped.
331	Cypher, David	8.10.7.4	93-94	36-54	T		The new procedures either prohibit entering or leaving Inquiry Response. After RAND slots return to inquiry scan on first inquiry message go to inquiry response and return FHS. At this point device is in inquiry response. Now what triggers the device out of this state?	It now appears that all actions are done in the inquiry scan substate and there is no need for the inquiry response state, so delete it and it related description.		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2138)
332	Gilb, James	8.3.1	44	35	T	Y	The paragraph states that the ACL link is a point-to-multipoint link, it is not, rather it is a point-to-point link. Only broadcast packets are point-multipoint and are, by definition, not links.	Change the sentence from "... is a point-to-multipoint link between the master and all the slaves ..." to "... is a point-to-point link between the master and one of the slaves ..."		R	C	The statement is true in the general sense. Point to point ACL links are specified in the next sentence.

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	Commenter Name:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	Comment Type:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
333	Cypher, David	8.3.2	44	50-53	T		What does this statement mean? It is in conflict with the statement in section 8.10.8.5.1 on page 102 line 20.	I have asked this on LB#3 and the reponse from BSIG is that to remove what is confusing to me would only confuse others. So please some one, any one, tell me what it means.		A	O	Re-submit Bluetooth Errata 1253, which was rejected, text is still unclear. Is the SCO slave always allowed to transmit in it's SCO, slot? We believe that the Slave is always allowed to send it's data in it's reserved slot. However, the current V1.1 text indicates a possible exception for slave transmission in it's reserved slot. To remove this ambiguity, delete "unless a different slave was aaddressed int the previous master-to-slave slot". or provide the conditions under which the exception will occur. Ref. Bluetooth Core v1.1 Part B Sec 3.2, 2nd Paragraph. ERRATA#2139
334	Gilb, James	8.8.2	77	38-39	T	Y	The variable N is used in the sentence, but not defined. (i.e. N is an even positive integer). This paragraph (like much of 8.9.2) repeats information found in 8.9.1 without adding any new information.	Either delete the paragraph because it adds no new information (preferred) or define N in same way it was been defined (at least twice) before when this same concept was explained.		R	C	The use of N is consistent througout this sub-clause. May have mis-understood the slave RX burst" which is the same slot as Master TX
335	Gilb, James	8.9.2	77	30-31	T	Y	The sentence "If a trigger event ..." is true only for the Master. A slave needs to hear the packet header, but may ignore the rest of the packet if it is not addressed to it. In the case of the Master RX, the packet should be addressed to the Master (if it isn't, there is a fault in the slave) and so it can be presumed that it should listen to the entire packet.	Change the sentence to indicate that it applies to the Master's RX and that the slave (as specified elsewhere) can go to sleep if it does not see either the broadcast address or its address in the packet header.		R	C	Comment confuses CAC with AM_ADDR.
336	Cypher, David	9.5.1.1	192	27	T		www.bluetooth.org/assigned-numbers.htm is password protected. How can one use IEEE 802.15.1 without this information?	Remove password protection		A	C	editorial changes will be made to point to IEEE archive specs
337	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	36	T	y	Statement is incorrect	Use fixed PIN and request responder to initiator switch		A	C	Change to Editorial
338	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	36	T	y	O (option) is changed to C.1	C.1 instead of O		A	C	Change to Editorial
339	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	38	T	y	Statement is incorrect	Use variable PIN		A	C	changed to editorial
340	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	41	T	y	Statement is incorrect	Accept initiator to responder switch		A	C	changed to editorial
341	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	41	T	y	O (option) is changed to C.1	C.1 instead of O		A	C	changed to editorial
342	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	43	T	y	C.1 comment will be changed	C.1: Mandatory to support at least one of A.19/4 and A.19/5		A	C	changed to editorial
343	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.4	272	44	T	y	add C.2	C.2: Mandatory to support if A.19/5 and(A.19/1 or A.19/2) is supported.		A	C	changed to editorial
344	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	277	53-54	T		Condition 2 has a lot of reference errors.	Change to "Mandatory to support if A.32/2 (Respond to park mode requests) is supported. If one of A.32/10 or A.32/11 is supported, both must be supported."		R	C	
345	Cypher, David	A.4.3.8	278	10 through 16	T		Condition and prerequisite are the same	Delete C.1 and change/replace with M		A	C	
346	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	51-53	T	y	Change statement of "C.1: Mandatory to support if… C.2:Mandatory to support …"	C.1: Mandatory to support if support of A.17/9 is stated in the feature request. C.2: IfA.32/2 (Respond to park mode requests) is supported then at least one of A.32/7(Request Unpark using PM_ADDR) and A.32/8(Request Unpark using BD_ADDR) is mandatory to support. C.3: Mandatory to support if A32/2 (Respond to park mode requests) is supported.		A	C	
347	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	42	T	y	Status is changed in Item 7	C.2 instead of O		A	C	
348	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	44	T	y	Status is changed in Item 8	C.2 instead of O		A	C	
349	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	48	T	y	Status is changed in Item 10	C.3 instead of C.2		A	C	
350	Watanabe, Fujio	A.4.3.8	277	50	T	y	Status is changed in Item 11	C.3 instead of C.2		A	C	
351	Cypher, David	A.4.3.9	278&279	50-54	T		Determining what is/are the requirement(s) is confusing. Current pics implies that item 2 & 3 must be present even if A.17/11 is not supported. I believe this to be wrong. All items should have the prerequisite A.17/11 and item 1 deleted.	Delete item 1 and add prerequisite A.17/11 to entire table.		A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) LB8 Reply Comment.	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
352	Watanabe, Fujio	A.6.2.3	287	6	T	y	Table A.49 Establishment Procedure is missing	Table A.49 is inserted		A	C	
353	Cypher, David	C.5.1.1.1	843	50	T		INQUIRY_SCAN is the state that may be periodically entered if a device wants to be available to repond to inquirys.	Change INQUIRY_RESPONSE to INQUIRY_SCAN		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2140)
354	Gilb, James	D.2.4	871	53	T	Y	The subclause ends prematurely, just as it was getting interesting.	Put in the rest of the text or delete the sub-clause		A	C	Ian to recover missing text
355	Cypher, David	G.8.2	920	7 through 46	T		The Figure shows that after invoking HCI_Write_loopback_Mode creating ACL and SCO connections are done. Yet reading the text of HCI the ACL and SCO must be already established in order for the data paths to be remotely looped back.	Figure needs to move these blocks before and after the remote loopback MSC		A	O	ERRATA Submitted (#2141)
356	Gilb, James	Introduction	iii	23-28	T	Y	The paragraph indicates that conformance to the standard is determined only by the Bluetooth qualifcation group rather than the standard itself. Products that conform to this open standard are those which meet the requirements contained in this document, not in other closed documents determined by closed entities. Furthermore, the wording of this section allows the BT SIG to change the conformance requirements without the review of the IEEE.	Remove the paragraph or change it so that conformance is determined by the standard, rather than by a closed organization and closed document.		R	C	IEEE 802 standards do not include conformance testing, therefore this comment does not apply. The paragraph sighted is not normative.
357	Marquess, Kevin	1	1	17-20			Bluetooth marketing might like the additional statement regarding the 'cable-replacement' technology. Or are we differentiating WPAN with this statement?			R	C	Addressed in other clauses
358	Marquess, Kevin	1	1	26			"which could allow the transfer" -- this is misleading and should have some clarification.			R	C	Paragraph 1.1 is the PAR scope.
359	Marquess, Kevin	1	1	30			"ensure" -- this is not in the PAR of 802.15.2 -- the language is too 'strong' here.			R	C	Paragraph 1.1 is the PAR scope.
360	Marquess, Kevin	3.25	6	36			Recommended to add that the coverage area is the POS which = 10m.			R	C	
361	Marquess, Kevin	3.46	7	46-48			'Choppy' grammatically and is not clear -- needs editorial work.			A	C	
362	Marquess, Kevin	3.49	8	3			We should develop a 'term' that would differentiate the 2 items.			A	C	
363	Marquess, Kevin	3.50	8	7			(.) <-- either end sentence and add additional sentence to describe comment -- or rewrite with the following: * that the max # of slaves that may be active within a piconet = 7.			R	C	Unnecessary restrictions for definition
364	Marquess, Kevin	3.57	8	29			1) Delete "1" @ end of "connection" 2) Additionally SCO = Synchronous Connection Oriented is defined later on the page in #3.61 which causes confusion. SCO should be defined first then used.			A	C	
365	Marquess, Kevin	3.58	8	35			Also 'textual' definition is defined within the ITU Recommendation.			A	C	
366	Marquess, Kevin	3.60	8	43			Grammer -- "discoverable" --> "discovered."			A	C	
367	Marquess, Kevin	3.64	8	54			Is "e.g. ..." (example) accurate?			A	C	
368	Marquess, Kevin	3.66	9	4			Grammer -- "request" --> "requested"			A	C	
369	Marquess, Kevin	4	11	16			BCH what is it? Beside 3 men's family names.			R	C	This is not a glossary.
370	Marquess, Kevin	4	11	22			BT = Bandwidth Time product (i.e. B*T)			A	C	
371	Marquess, Kevin	4	12	30			HID = Human Interface Device There is a Consortium which is specifying how devices should be designed.			A	C	
372	Marquess, Kevin	4	12	38			ID = Identity or Identification -- meaning depends upon point of reference.			A	C	

Comment Sequence Number e.g., 1, 2, etc.	CommenterName:	Clause:	Page:	Line:	CommentType:	Part of NO vote(Y/N)	Comment/Rationale (Issue and reasoning behind it.)	Recommended change (What change(s) it would take to make this clause acceptable.) *LB8 Reply Comment.*	Disposition/Rebuttal (Do not write here during ballot phase; this is for comment resolution phase.)	COMMENT STATUS X/received D/dispatched for consideration A/accepted R/rejected	RESPONSE STATUS O/open W/written C/closed U/unstatisfied Z/withdrawn	Editor Notes
373	Marquess, Kevin	4	13	7 & 8			[sic] LSFR -- what is the "appropriate" way of displaying an acronym? I would suggest that Line 8's method is correct since it indicates how the acroynm was derived. Additionally, I would suggest that all acronyms in this section are done in the same manner.			A	C	
374	Marquess, Kevin	4	13	32			Is MS = Multiplexing sublayer already contained in IEEE 100 (dictionary)? If not I would suggest to change to MuxS for clarity. MUX is understood to equal Multiplex/-ier.			A	C	
375	Marquess, Kevin	5	17	31			Word choice -- suggest change to --> "correlation"			A	C	
376	Marquess, Kevin	5	17	48			typo -- from			A	C	
377	Marquess, Kevin	12.1	243	32			improper page break			A	C	Editor Note: ICG IEEE-SA Project Editor will do this.
378	Marquess, Kevin	11.2.7.2	129	49 & 50			What is 'policy' regarding "Note:" usage? I would suggest that for clarity that Notes are made footnotes.			A	C	Editor Note: ICG I have made most "Note:" into "Note that…" thus chnging from Informative to Normative ala IEEE Style Manual.