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| This deliverable is poorly written and requires significant modifications to match usual deliverable quality standards. Especially use of English should be improved. Author should explain better why feedback from users has been not gathered. The purpose was not to gather requirements but feedback about the use of the portal – once the user register, contact information should be stored by the portal.  It also seems that parts of the platform have been not described like unity and e-grant. |
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| As should have been notified to the reviewers, the deliverable has been circulated before being finalized, due to the delay in writing the deliverable, hence the unfortunate poor quality of the writing.  I believe that problem with the missing feedback is not only due to the delay, as I explained in the deliverable. Of the earlier we had it in production with more capabilities and services integrated the earlier we would have gate feedback.  Unity is an internal component of the user registration portal, access.egi.eu, and I don’t believe it should be separated in the schemas since it would make it confused. In the architecture the role of Unity has been described. E-grant is even more subtle, since it is used just for an input form, and for the backend. I asked input (again) about the architecture, I hope I will manage to get something. I see the benefits of showing that we build on top of the other activities we already had, so I mentioned e-grant.  Thanks to the very detailed review I believe that the document is in a much better shape now. |

**Additional comments**

*(not affecting the document content e.g. recommendations for the future)*

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author (correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**

Note: English and typo corrections can be made directly in the document as comments.