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**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| The document is really rich and interesting and reflects well all the work done.  D2.8 is an update of D2.1 but do not follow the order as given in the titles (Communications, Dissemination and Engagement). Here dissemination as “the main exploitable results of the project” is presented is in first position. It is not really easy for the reader to compare the two documents in order to find the evolutions. Several parts present the work as a future work in the same manner at the beginning of the project. It has to be turned in current work.  There are large parts of D2.8 part 2 that are (often exactly) similar to D2.1 and do not present concrete evolutions or results. I wonder if they are necessary. As reviewer of a report and updated document I would like to find what has been done and what is modified. It is really difficult to find concrete results and changes in this part of the document.  Plans for the second period do not include clear plans for dissemination.  Communication and engagement parts are clear, well detailed. Concerning dissemination it is mainly only a presentation purpose. |
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| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**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” |  |
|  |  | **1.2** | I’m not sure this part is really useful. |  |
|  | **9** |  | **“**The document is structured in a number of sessions:” sessions -> sections? |  |
|  |  | **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 |  |
|  |  | **2.2** | I cannot see the results and the 2.2 section is more or less the 3.2.1 section of D2.1. |  |
|  |  | **2.3.2** | Links to the documents should be provided (for example <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2700>) that is given in 2.3.2.1 |  |
|  |  | **2.3.2.1** | <https://documents.egi.eu/public/ShowDocument?docid=2656> is empty  <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2700> is more related to the previous part. |  |
|  |  | **2.3.3** | <https://documents.egi.eu/document/2655> is at TOC level. I wonder if the link is useful. |  |
|  |  | **All document** | ANNEX do not exist. There are Appendix |  |
|  |  | **2.4.1.4** | LToS should be written Long Tail of Science |  |
|  |  | **2.4.1.4** | You need -> the researcher needs |  |
|  |  | **2.4.1.4** | The platform offers the following type of resources: -> The platform gives access to the following type of resources: |  |
|  |  | **3.1** | EGI-Engage will rely on the EGI communication channels -> EGI-Engage relies on the EGI communication channels |  |
|  |  | **3.1.1** | We miss a Director’s letters part that was in D2.1 |  |
|  | **24** | **3.2.1** | What is the concept for the Krakow event? It is named but not explained! |  |
|  |  | **3.2** | We miss external participation in events (it was in D2.1) |  |
|  | **29** |  | “Initial tests has started” -> “Initial tests have started” |  |
|  | **32** |  | Ophidia software community is “waiting for update” |  |
|  | **44** |  | You may replace the arrows by some text |  |
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