The following are the set of comments that were received within the prescribed cut-off date:

Sue LaVoie

The DPH is very well done. It's well organized and flows very well. I like the fact that the body of the document stays at a higher level and the very detailed information is included in the Appendices. This approach gives the reader a solid foundation on which to build.

I have 2 VERY minor comments – 2 spelling, 1 format:

Page 29, 6.3.2 - "For example, if you ae labeling….
Formatting of Appendix L is different from others. This is likely because of the table starting on page 106.

There are still some TBDs and other comments that I assume you're working on as we review.

This document is a huge improvement over previous versions. Good job!

Edward A. Guinness

Here are my comments on the DPH. Let me know if something I noted is not clear.

DPH 1.7.0.0 comments

Section 1.3 – I didn't think Appendix B (which is mentioned in this section) adds much to the document and the material could be merged into the main body (see next comment).

Section 3. This checklist overlaps a great deal with Appendix B other than saying to start archiving process early. Can't the material in Section 3 and Appendix B be merged together and remove Appendix B?

Section 6 – I think that most of the discussions of LDD should be part of the LDDtool documentation set. It is my opinion that data producers should not be creating LDDs without significant consultation of a PDS node. The reason is largely that published LDDs have to be maintained by PDS and PDS needs to understand them in detail. We can't have the risk that a producer may create a LDD that is inconsistent with PDS4 principles. Maybe others nodes have different opinions. I think it is enough for this document to explain what a LDD is and show the mechanics of referencing them in a label.

Section 10, first paragraph – To me, peer review is not relevant to this section because it is not the case that a fully assembled archive is needed for peer review. In fact, elsewhere in this document it discusses several different scenarios of what is needed for peer review.

Section 10, fifth paragraph – I don't see a directory naming requirement in the Standards Reference, certainly not in section 2.b.2.2, which is a section about data transfer and it never says whether the naming scheme is required or just recommended.

Section 12.1 – I looked at the ROSES 2016 and searched for the word 'certified'. I found only one DAP (LDAP) that mentioned certified data. It said that if the data were not certified then the proposer had to justify how any issues with the data would be overcome. So, the wording in paragraph 4 that proposers can only use data that is certified is not correct.

Appendix B – I already mentioned my thoughts of combining this appendix with a section in the main body of the text. Also, the bullet on time formats is a bit misleading because CCB-101 and CCB-161 constrain a number of time attributes in the common dictionary to be in yyyy-mm-dd format.

Appendix C – The figure is too complex and does not add to the text that is already there, in my opinion.

Appendix H - I think that the equations in the bulleted section could use more description. They were confusing to me.

Appendix K – As mentioned, I think creating LDD should not be part of the DPH. I did not review this section because it has not been updated.

Appendix M.1 – Is there a tool or script that a producer can use to create the inventory file? Or, can the process be described?

I had several minor wording suggestions that I gave to Susie on a paper copy of the document.