Cl **FM** *SC* **FM** *P* **1** *L* **31** # 26

Ran, Adee Cisco systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

802.3cv is published.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "IEEE Std 802.3cv-20xx" to "IEEE Std 802.3cv-2021", here and on page 16.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 20

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

According to the style manual subclause 16.4, table notes should be placed as follows: "A table note should be set immediately following the table to which it belongs, enclosed within the boxed table, above the bottom border of the table."
Several table notes were added to several tables in recent drafts but not placed according to this guidance.

SuggestedRemedy

Fix the table note at the following page/line: 169/24, 179/21, 251/46, 255/25, 283/28

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
[Editor's note: CC: 120G, 162, 162B]

Cl **00** *SC* **0** *P* **0** *L* **0** # 5

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

802.3ck will not be incorporated into the next amendment (802.3dc) so it will be amendment to that revision.

SuggestedRemedy

Convert draft to be an amendment of new revision (802.3dc) rather than an amendment of 802.3-2018.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **80** *SC* **80.1.5** *P* **80** *L* **45** # 2

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PHY table (bucket1)*

In Table 80-4a, 100GAUI-1 C2C and C2M have been added to several PHY types, but the physical layer tables in the corresponding PMD clauses have not been updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Amend the 100 Gb/s physical layer tables in clauses 138 and 140 to include 100GAUI-1 C2C and C2M sublayers.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **116** *SC* **116.1.4** *P* **98** *L* **18** # 3

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PHY table (bucket1)*

In Table 116-3, 200GAUI-2 C2C and C2M have been added to several 200 Gb/s PHY types, but the physical layer tables in the corresponding PMD clauses have not been updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Amend the 200 Gb/s physical layer tables in clauses 121 and 122 to include 200GAUI-2 C2C and C2M sublayers.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **116** *SC* **116.1.4** *P* **99** *L* **18** # 4

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type **T** *Comment Status* **D** *PHY table (bucket1)*

In Table 116-4, 400GAUI-4 C2C and C2M have been added to several 400 Gb/s PHY types, but the physical layer tables in the corresponding PMD clauses have not been updated.

SuggestedRemedy

Amend the 400 Gb/s physical layer tables in clauses 122, 123, 124, 138, 150, and 151 to include 400GAUI-4 C2C and C2M sublayers.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **116**
SC **116.1.4**

Page 1 of 10
2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM

Cl **120**　　*SC* **120.5.11.2.a**　　　*P* **110**　　*L* **48**　　　# 80

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*bucket1*

120.5.7 should be a hot link

SuggestedRemedy

fix it

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.1.5**　　　*P* **252**　　*L* **15**　　　# 8

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*transition time (bucket1)*

Reference to transition time methodology.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "transition time" to "transition time (see 120G.3.1.4)".
Repeat at:
page 254, line 13
page 258, lines 43/44
page 262, lines 10/11

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.1.5**　　　*P* **252**　　*L* **20**　　　# 47

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　　Cisco systems

Comment Type　**ER**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*test setup figures (bucket1)*

Figure 120G–6 should be edited to correctly show the plugging of the HCB into either the
MCB or the host under test, and the locations of test points, similarly to the updated Figure
120G–9.

Similarly for Figure 120G–7 for plugging into the MCB.

SuggestedRemedy

Update the figures with editorial license.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments 47, 69, 70, 60, 65, and 67 propose various changes to the test configuration
figures for host output, module output, host input, and module input.
Implement with editorial license along with the other related comments.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.1.5**　　　*P* **252**　　*L* **28**　　　# 69

Ben Artsi, Liav　　　　　　　　　　Marvell Technology

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*test setup figures (bucket1)*

The location of TP4 label may be misleading. One may be confused to understand TP4 is
located at the connector between the HCB and MCB and one may need to de-embed to
get to that point

SuggestedRemedy

Take TP4 label closer to the calibration point at the output of the MCB, or change the
scheme to one closer to what can be found in the OIF. In figure 120G–9 on page 258 it is
clear

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments 47, 69, 70, 60, 65, and 67 propose various changes to the test configuration
figures for host output, module output, host input, and module input.
Implement with editorial license along with the other related comments.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.2**　　　*P* **253**　　*L* **1**　　　# 48

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　　　Cisco systems

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*bucket1*

"Table 120G–3—Module output characteristics (at TP4)" - Parentheses are inconsistent
with other similar tables (Host output in this annex, and Transmitter characteristics
elsewhere).

SuggestedRemedy

Change title to "Module output characteristics at TP4"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　　*Cl* **120G**　　　Page 2 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn　　*SC* **120G.3.2**　　2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.2.2**　　　*P* **254**　　*L* **23**　　　# 70

Ben Artsi, Liav　　　　　　　　Marvell Technology

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*test setup figures (bucket1)*

The location of TP4 label may be misleading. One may be confused to understand TP4 is located at the connector between the HCB and MCB and one may need to de-embed to get to that point

SuggestedRemedy

Take TP4 label closer to the calibration point at the output of the MCB, or change the scheme to one closer to what can be found in the OIF. In figure 120G–9 on page 258 it is clear

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments 47, 69, 70, 60, 65, and 67 propose various changes to the test configuration figures for host output, module output, host input, and module input.
Implement with editorial license along with the other related comments.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.2.2**　　　*P* **254**　　*L* **24**　　　# 60

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*test setup figures (bucket1)*

Figure 120G-7 could be improved with relation of module DUT, switch, and there is no need for DC blocks on the output of HCB

SuggestedRemedy

Please center MCB with HCB above and module DUT under to make it more clear that both are inserted into MCB, remove DC blocks from HCB, and improve the switch figure

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments 47, 69, 70, 60, 65, and 67 propose various changes to the test configuration figures for host output, module output, host input, and module input.
Implement with editorial license along with the other related comments.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.3.1**　　　*P* **256**　　*L* **4**　　　# 52

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　Cisco systems

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*bucket1*

It is preferable to refer to the value in table 120G-7 than to repeat it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "for any signaling rate in the range
53.125 GBd ± 100 ppm" to "for any signaling rate in the range specified in Table 120G-7".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.3.4.1**　　　*P* **257**　　*L* **31**　　　# 89

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*bucket1*

"host reference channel" here means "reference host channel" in other places. It would be better to align with other places.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "host reference channel" to "reference host channel"

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.3.4.1**　　　*P* **258**　　*L* **18**　　　# 65

Ghiasi, Ali　　　　　　　　Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **ER**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*test setup figures (bucket1)*

The figure can improve

SuggestedRemedy

Please consider following improvements:
- Make line to either stress or DUT solid and the other dotted
- The arrows in the Host under test are confusing

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments 47, 69, 70, 60, 65, and 67 propose various changes to the test configuration figures for host output, module output, host input, and module input.
Implement with editorial license along with the other related comments.

Cl **120G**　　*SC* **120G.3.3.4.2**　　　*P* **259**　　*L* **20**　　　# 90

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **TR**　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　*bucket1*

The 'Value' for 'Crosstalk differential peak-to-peak voltage' is 870, which is without unit. Unit of voltage shall be included here as other items.

SuggestedRemedy

Change '870' to '870 mV'

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general　　　*Cl* **120G**　　Page 3 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn　　*SC* **120G.3.3.4.2**　　2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.4.1**   *P* **260**   *L* **30**   # 56

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

It is preferable to refer to the value in table 120G-9 than to repeat it.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "for any signaling rate in the range
53.125 GBd ± 100 ppm" to "for any signaling rate in the range specified in Table 120G-9".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.3.4.2.1**   *P* **261**   *L* **18**   # 67

Ghiasi, Ali   Ghiasi Quantum/Inphi

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *test setup figures (bucket1)*

The figure can improve

SuggestedRemedy

Please consider following improvements:
- Make line to either stress or DUT solid and the other dotted
- The arrows in the Host under test are confusing

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Comments 47, 69, 70, 60, 65, and 67 propose various changes to the test configuration figures for host output, module output, host input, and module input.
Implement with editorial license along with the other related comments.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.5.2**   *P* **265**   *L* **51**   # 38

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

The list in this subclause starts at h) instead of a).

SuggestedRemedy

Change the list format to start at a).

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **120G**   *SC* **120G.5.2**   *P* **265**   *L* **51**   # 10

Brown, Matt   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

Method should start at step "a)" not "h)"

SuggestedRemedy

Reformat list to start at "a)".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **161**   *SC* **161.5.2.8**   *P* **134**   *L* **3**   # 18

Brown, Matt   Huawei

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

To address the editor's note a simple change to 161.5.2.9 can address the main concern of D2.1 Comment #163. The terms "FEC encode" and "Reed-Solomon" encoded should be reconciled. All other references in Clause 161 to encoding are preceded by "Reed-Solomon" not "FEC". The same holds for decoder except for one instance.
Reed-Solomon encoder 3x
Reed-Solomon encoding 1x
Reed-Solomon encoded 2x
Reed-Solomon encode 2x
FEC encoded 1x
Reed-Solomon decode 1x
Reed-Solomon decoding 1x
Reed-Solomon decoder 9x
decoder 1x

SuggestedRemedy

In 161.5.2.9, change "FEC encoded" to "Reed-Solomon" encoded.
In 161.5.3.3 (page 136, line 31), change "decoder" to "Reed-Solomon decoder"

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve the first part of the suggested remedy using the response to comment #27.
In 161.5.3.3 (page 136, line 31), change "decoder" to "Reed-Solomon decoder"

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **161**   Page 4 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **161.5.2.8**   2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **161**　　*SC* **161.5.2.9**　　　　*P* **134**　　*L* **3**　　　# 27

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco systems

Comment Type **T**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*bucket1*

The text can be made more precise to avoid possible confusion of "FEC encoded" vs. "Reed-Solomon encoded" and to clarify where the codewords come from and what is being distributed.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Once the data has been FEC encoded, two FEC codewords" to "Once the data has been encoded per 161.5.2.8, two resulting codewords"

On line 16, change "Once the data has been Reed-Solomon encoded and interleaved, it shall be distributed" to "tx_out<1087:0> shall be distributed".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Change "Once the data has been FEC encoded, two FEC codewords" to "Once the data has been Reed-Solomon encoded, two resulting FEC codewords"
On line 16, change "Once the data has been Reed-Solomon encoded and interleaved, it shall be distributed" to "tx_out<1087:0> shall be distributed".

Cl **162**　　*SC* **162.1**　　　　*P* **149**　　*L* **15**　　　# 82

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　　MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **E**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*bucket1*

The hyperlink of "Figure 162-1" is not correct. It is linked to Table 162-1.

SuggestedRemedy

Correct the hyperlink of "Figure 162-1".

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**　　*SC* **162.9.3**　　　　*P* **162**　　*L* **12**　　　# 83

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　　MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **E**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*bucket1*

There is no "hyperlink" to 162A.2.

SuggestedRemedy

The hyperlink ot 162A.2 shall be added in the sentence "The transmitter characteristics at TP0 are provided informatively in 162A.2."

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**　　*SC* **162.9.3**　　　　*P* **163**　　*L* **5**　　　# 28

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco systems

Comment Type **TR**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*bucket1*

In Table 162–10 the first parameter is "Signaling rate, each (nominal)" - but the value is 53.125 ± 50 ppm so this label is incorrect (nominal is 53.125).

This label is inconsistent: in Table 163-5 it is just "Signaling rate", in Table 120F-1 and Table 120G-1 it is "Signaling rate, each lane (range)".

The "(range)" seems correct. The words "each lane" are unnecessary - all parameters in these tables are per-lane.

Make the label consistent across the similar tables.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the label to "Signaling rate (range)" in all 4 tables.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ck D2.1 and D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.
Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Change the label to "Signaling rate, each lane (range)" for all 4 tables.
[Editor's note: CC: 120F, 120G, 162, 162]

Cl **162**　　*SC* **162.9.3**　　　　*P* **163**　　*L* **15**　　　# 99

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　　*Comment Status* **D**　　　　　　*bucket1*

Now that we have established a consistent way of naming these return losses, let's make it easier for the reader to find them.

SuggestedRemedy

Please add "RLcc", "RLdc" and so on in the table rows as we do for ERL, VEC, vf and others, throughout the draft. Also in running text such as 162.9.3.6. Similarly Rpeak.

Proposed Response　　　*Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162**
SC **162.9.3**

Page 5 of 10
2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.9.3.4**   *P* **168**   *L* **1**   # 31

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

120D.3.1.2 is not the correct reference for the pattern symbols and thresholds.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 120D.3.1.2 to Table 120D–4.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.9.3.4**   *P* **168**   *L* **22**   # 24

Hidaka, Yasuo   Credo Semiconductor, Inc.

Comment Type **E**   *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

164 on the row F10 and the column of index of last symbol is a typo.

SuggestedRemedy

Change 164 with 264.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.9.4**   *P* **170**   *L* **39**   # 32

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **ER**   *Comment Status* **D**   *signaling rate (bucket1)*

The receiver specifications tables the signaling rate parameter has inconsistent name across tables. In Table 162–14 it is "Signaling rate", in Table 163–8 "Receiver signaling rate", in Table 120F–4, Table 120G–7, and Table 120G–9 "Signaling rate, each lane (range)".

The word "(range)" seems correct. The words "each lane" are unnecessary - all parameters in these tables are per-lane. Similarly "Receiver" is unnecessary.

Make the label consistent across the similar tables.

SuggestedRemedy

Change the label to "Signaling rate (range)" in all 4 tables.

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ck D2.1 and D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.
Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

Change in all tables to be consistent with Table 120G-9:
"Signaling rate, each lane (range)"
[Editor's note: CC: 120F, 120G, 162, 163]

Cl **162**   *SC* **162.9.4.1**   *P* **171**   *L* **4**   # 33

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **T**   *Comment Status* **D**   *UI value (bucket1)*

"This translates to a nominal unit interval of 18.82353 ps" - even with 5 digits after the decimal, this is not the nominal unit interval but an approximation.

In fact, 4 digits (0.1 fs resolution) result in about 1 ppm error, which is sufficient for any practical purpose.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "18.82353" to "approximately 18.8235".

Proposed Response   *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **162**   Page 6 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **162.9.4.1**   2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.2** *P* **171** *L* **12** # 84

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

The peak-to-peak differential output voltage is defined in Table 162-10 footnote b, instead of "footnote a".

SuggestedRemedy

Change "Table 162-10 footnote a" to "Table 162-10 footnote b".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

This comment does not apply to the substantive changes between IEEE P802.3ck D2.1 and D2.0 or the unsatisfied negative comments from the initial ballot.
Hence it is not within the scope of the recirculation ballot.

However, the proposed change is an improvement to the draft.

Implement the suggested remedy.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.3.3** *P* **172** *L* **25** # 6

Brown, Matt Huawei

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *transition time (bucket1)*

Transition time is referred to here as "20% to 80% transition time". It is defined explicitly in 120E.3.1.5. Transition time is usually referred to elsewhere in draft as just "transition time". Align terminology.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "20% to 80% transition time" to "transition time"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.3.3** *P* **173** *L* **25** # 112

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

fhp is not defined.

SuggestedRemedy

Define fhp

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.3.4** *P* **174** *L* **8** # 114

Dawe, Piers Nvidia

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

These equations for spectral density mask are too obscure.

SuggestedRemedy

Add a graph

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Implement the suggested remedy with editorial license.

Cl **162** *SC* **162.9.4.4.2** *P* **175** *L* **18** # 85

Wu, Mau-Lin MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

The reference here is missed in D2.1. It's (see 162.9.4.3.4 in D2.0). No comments were accepted to change this in D2.0.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "(see)" to "(see 162.9.4.3.4)"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Reference to 162.9.4.3.4 is not helpful since that subclause does not address added sinusoidal jitter. Given that the previous subclause 162.9.4.4.1 describes the test setup including sinusoidal jitter this reference can be deleted.
Delete "(see)".

Cl **162** *SC* **162.11.7.1** *P* **184** *L* **7** # 81

Dudek, Mike Marvell

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D** *bucket1*

93A.1.2.3, Equation 93A-13, 93A-14 and Table 162-19 should be hot links or green text.

SuggestedRemedy

fix them

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **162**
SC **162.11.7.1**

Page 7 of 10
2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM

Cl **162**　　*SC* **162.11.7.1**　　　*P* **184**　　*L* **8**　　　　# 86

Wu, Mau-Lin　　　　　　　　　　MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*bucket1*

There is no "hyperlink" to Table 162-19.

SuggestedRemedy

Add hyperlink to Table 162-19

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **162A**　　*SC* **162A.5**　　　*P* **277**　　*L* **30**　　　# 11

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*terminology (bucket1)*

The acronym "IL" is often used to represent "insertion loss" in text, but is never formally introduced.

SuggestedRemedy

Either introduce it properly, e.g., "insertion loss (IL)" or expand it everywhere.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Introduce the acronym properly, e.g., "insertion loss (IL) with editorial license.

Cl **162B**　　*SC* **162B.1.2.1**　　*P* **280**　　*L* **41**　　　# 12

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　　　*bucket1*

Ilcatf and f should be italic.

SuggestedRemedy

Format as italic.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.2**　　　*P* **200**　　*L* **5**　　　　# 19

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**T**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*table note (bucket1)*

Table 163-5 is a normative table, but footnote c relating to transmitter waveform is a recommendation.

SuggestedRemedy

Convert footnote c to a table note (see style manual 16.4) or delete footnote c.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
This can also be fixed by placing the recommendation in regular text.
The comment equally applies to footnote c in Table 162-10.
Remove footnote c from Table 163-5 and Table 162-10 and add a new sentence to the end of the first paragraph in 162.9.3.1.4 as follows:
"It is recommended that the same step size is used for all coefficients."

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.2**　　　*P* **200**　　*L* **12**　　　# 17

Brown, Matt　　　　　　　　　　Huawei

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*table footnote (bucket1)*

For the SNDR specification in Table 163-5, footnote d is redundant. The reference column points to 162.9.3.3 which provides the exact same information as footnote a.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete footnote a.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
Resolve using the response to comment #77.

Cl **163**　　*SC* **163.9.2**　　　*P* **200**　　*L* **21**　　　# 77

Dudek, Mike　　　　　　　　　　Marvell

Comment Type　**E**　　*Comment Status*　**D**　　　*table footnote (bucket1)*

Footnote d to table 163-5 just duplicates the information in the short section that this footnote refers to.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the footnote.

Proposed Response　　*Response Status*　**W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.
Remove footnote d.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected　　RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **163**
SC **163.9.2**

Page 8 of 10
2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM

Cl **163** *SC* **163.9.3.1** *P* **202** *L* **37** # 34

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   *signaling rate (bucket1)*

It is preferable to refer to the value in table 163-8 than to repeat it. (The NOTE can stay as it is).

SuggestedRemedy

Change "for any signaling rate in the range
53.125 GBd ± 100 ppm" to "for any signaling rate in the range specified in Table 163-8".

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163** *SC* **163.9.3.5** *P* **205** *L* **30** # 44

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

"Q3d" is formatted with inconsistent roman/italic font.

SuggestedRemedy

For consistency with clause 162, use italics for all occurrences of Q3d.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163** *SC* **163.9.3.5** *P* **205** *L* **31** # 25

Hidaka, Yasuo   Credo Semiconductor, Inc.

Comment Type **E** *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

Symbol Q3 remains in NOTE 1.

SuggestedRemedy

Change Q(Q3) with Q(Q3d).

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163** *SC* **163.9.3.5** *P* **205** *L* **31** # 45

Ran, Adee   Cisco systems

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

In NOTE 1, "Q(Q3)" should be "Q(Q3d)".

SuggestedRemedy

Change per comment.

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163** *SC* **163.10** *P* **206** *L* **38** # 87

Wu, Mau-Lin   MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

Maximum AC-coupling 3 dB corner frequency shall be 50 kHz, instead of 50 Hz, based on 163.10.7

SuggestedRemedy

Change the "Unit" in Table 163-10 from "Hz" to "kHz"

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163** *SC* **163.10** *P* **206** *L* **40** # 88

Wu, Mau-Lin   MediaTek Inc.

Comment Type **TR** *Comment Status* **D**   *bucket1*

The note "a" here is specific for Cable assembly and shall be removed, due to this is KR Clause

SuggestedRemedy

Remove note a

Proposed Response *Response Status* **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
When this table was created in D2.1 the referenced footnote was accidentally included.
There was no comment to include the provision in this footnote.
Delete table footnote a.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general *Cl* **163** Page 9 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn *SC* **163.10** 2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line

Cl **163A**   *SC* **163A.3.1.3**   *P* **308**   *L* **25**   # 22

Hidaka, Yasuo   Credo Semiconductor, Inc.

Comment Type   **T**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *bucket1*

f_r is also a parameter specified by the clause that invokes this method but missing in the list.

SuggestedRemedy

Change "A_t and T_b" with "A_t, T_b and f_r" in page 308 line 25.
Apply the same change to page 307 line 13.

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

Cl **163A**   *SC* **163A.3.1.3**   *P* **308**   *L* **43**   # 1

Brown, Matt   Huawei

Comment Type   **E**   *Comment Status*   **D**   *bucket1*

extra closing parenthesis "Tr(ref))"

SuggestedRemedy

remove extra closing parenthesis

Proposed Response   *Response Status*   **W**

PROPOSED ACCEPT.

TYPE: TR/technical required ER/editorial required GR/general required T/technical E/editorial G/general   *Cl* **163A**   Page 10 of 10
COMMENT STATUS: D/dispatched A/accepted R/rejected   RESPONSE STATUS: O/open W/written C/closed U/unsatisfied Z/withdrawn   *SC* **163A.3.1.3**   2021-07-14 4:46:00 PM
SORT ORDER: Clause, Subclause, page, line