Cl **149**　　*SC* **149.8.2.1**　　　　*P* **14**　　*L* **13**　　　# 1

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **X**

Per the NOTE in page 13, the editorial instruction "Change" is used for text and tables, and includes a description of what is being changed using strikethrough and underline marking. A "Replace" instruction is used for figures and equations and does not include such marking.

In the draft, the instruction for Equation 149–27 is "Replace" and there is a red X marking on the old equation - which does not match the NOTE. When "replace" is used the existing equation should not appear at all.

Showing the change from the existing equation might be useful for reviewers; this can be done in an editor's note, such as "The new equation has >= sign where the existing equation had a <= sign". This note is not required in the standard itself and would be removed before publication.

Also applies to Equation 165-42.

SuggestedRemedy

Delete the existing equation and the red X marking.

Consider adding an editor's note to explain the change - although it is not strictly required.

Apply in both equations.

Proposed Response　　　　　*Response Status* **O**

Cl **165**　　*SC* **165.8.2.1**　　　　*P* **16**　　*L*　　　# 2

Ran, Adee　　　　　　　　　　Cisco

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **X**

The label used in Figure 165-38 is "Meets equation constraint". In all other similar figures in IEEE Std 802.3-2022 the label is "Meets equation constraints".

(I see that this should be corrected in several figures in 802.3cy - this can be done in the next revision, but the one in this corrigendum can be fixed now)

SuggestedRemedy

Change "constraint" to "constraints".

Proposed Response　　　　　*Response Status* **O**

Cl **165**　　*SC* **165**　　　　*P* **16**　　*L* **14**　　　# 3

Simms, William　　　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **X**

Unclear what 'Meets equation contrstraint" note in figure 165-38 means

SuggestedRemedy

Add clarity by hash or grey fill passing region below the line or highlight using the same for the failing region above the line

Proposed Response　　　　　*Response Status* **O**

Cl **165**　　*SC* **165**　　　　*P* **16**　　*L* **5**　　　# 4

Simms, William　　　　　　　　NVIDIA

Comment Type **T**　　*Comment Status* **X**

Figure 165-38 does not match the equation 165-42 for the region between f=0 and 10MHz. F=0-10MHz is undefined by the equations.

SuggestedRemedy

Resolve by adding 0-10MHz in the equation or by starting the plot at (10MHz, 6dB) rather than (0,0)

Proposed Response　　　　　*Response Status* **O**

Cl **165**　　*SC* **165.8.2.1**　　　　*P* **16**　　*L* **3**　　　# 5

Dawe, Piers　　　　　　　　　Nvidia

Comment Type **E**　　*Comment Status* **X**

Equation 165-42 says 20 - 20log10(50/f), from 10 to 50 MHz. That's 6 dB at 10 MHz.

SuggestedRemedy

Assuming that the figure should illustrate the equation: redraw it so that the line starts at 6 dB.

Proposed Response　　　　　*Response Status* **O**

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: Comment ID

Comment ID **5**

Page 1 of 1
5/11/2024 11:26:42 AM