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**General comments on the content**
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| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
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**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author (correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **6** |  | **“**Evolving these services according to researchers’ needs is also inevitable, to continue providing value”  Inevitable is not pro-active enough. I would prefer something like “is part of the continuous improvement process”  “To continue” is not positive enough. I would prefer something such as “to increase the value” | Correction accepted |
|  |  | **1.2** | I’m not sure this part is really useful. | This part helps relating the current activities with the project objectives |
|  | **9** |  | **“**The document is structured in a number of sessions:” sessions -> sections? | Correction accepted |
|  |  | **2.2** | I do not understand why this sentence “The accounting team will collaborate… “is in future in a report  “the newly launched EGI Federated Cloud Infrastructure Platform” is no more new | Correction accepted |
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|  |  | **2.3.3** | <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2655> is at TOC level. I wonder if the link is useful. | Correction Rejected: The linked document has been updated |
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|  |  | **3.1.1** | We miss a Director’s letters part that was in D2.1 | Correction rejected: Director’s letter were not prioritized by management |
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