

ID	CommenterName	Response	Comment Response		
			Status	Status	Editor's Modification to Align with REVCOM
5	Hajduczenia, Marek	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
6	Hajduczenia, Marek	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Added that i-190 is ACCEPT.
16	Anslow, Peter	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Added that i-190 is ACCEPT.
24	Thompson, Michael	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
33	Yseboodt, Lennart	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
34	Yseboodt, Lennart	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
46	Tillmanns, Ralf	REJECT. According to IEEE Standards style, 'may' can be	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
63	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Added that i-159 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
64	Graber, Steffen	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
85	Graber, Steffen	REJECT. The polynomials in 146.3.4.3 are different, there is	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
94	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-83.	A	C	Added that i-83 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
99	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-83.	A	C	Added that i-83 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
100	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-83.	A	C	Added that i-83 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
103	Graber, Steffen	REJECT. The same information (that there is both a forced	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
106	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-83.	A	C	Added that i-83 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
109	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-83.	A	C	Added that i-83 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
110	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-83.	A	C	Added that i-83 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
124	Graber, Steffen	REJECT. Wording is clear.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
132	Graber, Steffen	REJECT. While "reply back" indeed is somewhat redundant,	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
143	Graber, Steffen	REJECT. Wording looks correct	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
144	Graber, Steffen	REJECT. "one and only one" is logically different from "only	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
148	Graber, Steffen	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Superseded by resolution of i-373.	A	C	Deleted "PROPOSED." from response to comment i-373
162	Zimmerman, George	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	added ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. To response to comment i-80
181	Hoglund, David	REJECT. The intended meaning is not "secured" (fixed to its	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
183	Xu, Dayin	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. RESOLVED BY COMMENT i-369, THE PROPOSED	A	C	Deleted "PROPOSED." from response to comment i-369
240	Thompson, Geoffrey	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Added that i-42 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
247	Thompson, Geoffrey	REJECT. As a PHY, proper implementation of layering	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
260	Thompson, Geoffrey	REJECT. The identical language is used in several 802.3	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
283	McCarthy, Mick	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Added that i-282 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
287	Schicketanz, Dieter	REJECT. There is no specific issue identified and no suggested remedy to implement.	R	C	Added "Proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRG can understand the specific changes that will satisfy the commenter."
292	Schicketanz, Dieter	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
293	Schicketanz, Dieter	REJECT.	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
294	Schicketanz, Dieter	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	W	Added that i-321 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.

296	Schicketanz, Dieter	REJECT. Existing text references the normative requirements	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
297	Schicketanz, Dieter	REJECT. The existing reference to 146.7 is clear. When the	R	C	Added "The CRG disagrees with the commenter."
298	Schicketanz, Dieter	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Added that i-169 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
299	Schicketanz, Dieter	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.  Accommodated by i-111. The resolution to i-111 is:  Change the value 13.5 dB to 13 dB within Equation 146-13. Change the frequency dependency of the RL below 0.5 MHz from $9 + 9 \times f$ to $9 + 8 \times f$ .	A	W	Added that comment i-111 is ACCEPT.
300	Schicketanz, Dieter	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	W	Added that 113 is ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.
304	Schicketanz, Dieter	REJECT. Commenter provides insufficient information to determine a specific remedy. It is unclear what commenter is referring to by "so many options". The purpose of this sentence is to clearly state that anyone implementing cabling should focus mainly to the normative requirements for the link segment or mixing segment, as appropriate (i.e. 147.7 or 147.8).	R	C	Changed first sentence to "Proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRG can understand the specific changes that will satisfy the commenter."
314	Kabra, Lokesh	REJECT.  Suggested remedy in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRG can understand the specific changes that satisfy the commenter.	R	C	Changed to "Proposed change in the comment does not contain sufficient detail so that the CRG can understand the specific changes that will satisfy the commenter."
315	Kabra, Lokesh	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Add that comment i-62 is ACCEPT.
334	Law, David	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	C	Deleted "PROPOSED" from response to comment i-159
356	Law, David	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Accommodated by comment i-360.	A	C	Deleted "PROPOSED." from response to comment i-360
374	Law, David	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. Superseded by resolution of i-373.	A	C	Deleted "PROPOSED" from response to comment i-373
401	Kim, Yongbum	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE.	A	W	Added that comment 191 is "ACCEPT."
420	Law, David	ACCEPT.	A	C	Delete "PROPOSED" from response to i-424
429	Law, David	ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. RESOLVED BY COMMENT i-424, THE PROPOSED	A	C	Deleted "PROPOSED" from response to comment i-424