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**General comments on the content**
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| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The document is well written. It has a clear, useful structure and in vast majority solid contents. It fulfils well the role of a report on progress made. There are minor issues to fix in order to have even better quality report. See detailed comments. Some trivial issues has been put into the document text directly with change tracking or as a comments. Please be aware document is missing sections 1,7 and 8 (not requested to be under a review process). |
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**Additional comments**
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| **From reviewer:** |
| In some paragraphs it is difficult to get what is the goal of the works reported. Some authors uses very nice style of reporting: what were the goals to achieve and to what extent they were fulfilled (see e.g. page 24). It would be nice to have such approach for each contribution.Consistency with EGI-Engage DoW. I generally looked at DoW here: <https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/EGI-Engage> and reported larger topics which seems not referred in the report. In my opinion if something was written in DoW we should at least provide some explanation what’s going on with the topic. This would help the Project to not forget of any important works.User communities section (SA2) is sometimes difficult to understand due to the text being packed with acronyms and scientific domain-related content. I think it is possible to make it more understandable for not prepared reader but this perhaps would need to be requested at the time or asking for contributions.The Review Form template recommends that typos are corrected directly as comments. I would suggest to fix typos with change tracking mode on instead of commenting them. This way the editor can approve/reject changes and then copy-paste the paragraph into final document. |
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| **2** | **32** | **4.2.2** | The DoW mentions extensions to AppDB and CMFs which is not referred by the report. |  |
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