OVERALL COMMENTS

The introduction, the science case, and the summary do not say anything that is really unique to ILD compared to SiD, in particular there is no mention of the TPC. I think this needs to be fixed. The summary should probably do a better job of summarizing the actual results contained in the document.

Style details.
1. Good to go through thoroughly with a spell checker. (example ispell).
2. All the sections should be consistent in terms of capitalization.
   In practice it seems better to avoid over-capitalization.
3. Be consistent in terms of British English / American English, presumably the former.

Initial pages
Page iii) Integration -> integration
         Vallee should have an acute?

Section 1. INTRODUCTION
This is a reasonable introduction. The word "intense" is overused. It is used twice here and in the summary and probably should be deleted in all three cases.
(intense scrutiny in section 2 is OK in that context).

Page 1.
L6. This documents -> This document
L10 Gev -> GeV
L10/11 "1 TeV, the largest possible energy reach of the ILC". This does not send the correct message since the site geology and potential accelerating gradient could go beyond this. May be best to simply put a full stop after 1 TeV, and then merge the first two sentences.
The point is that it is not cost effective to imagine having different detectors for different energies, and that the detector design necessarily has to support a wide collision energy range. Or maybe change to "as conceived for the ILC program as discussed in the ILC TDR and/or DBD".
L12 but maintain -> while maintaining

L22 effectivness -> effectiveness
L23 criterium -> criterion
L32 adopt to -> adapt to (or did you mean just adopt).

Page 2.
L10. place -> place,
L15. 2018 cost seems a bit weird.

Section 2. SCIENCE CASE

This was pretty readable.

Page 3.
L6 the Universe -> the very early Universe
L6 and L8 "the recombination" - needs to be better qualified, or rephrased.
Recombination of what? - maybe better still "formation of atoms"? And using words
like transparency / opaque to light?
L21 EW->electroweak
L27 Electroweak -> electroweak
I would avoid introducing the unnecessary EW acronym here and in L28.
L28 Bing Bang -> the Big Bang.
L38 the ILD -> the ILD detector

Page 4.
L2 center -> centre (BE).
L7 1% or below level -> 1% level or below
L9 undertaking -> undertaken
L12 remove "which"
L13 includes -> include
L29. table ??
L30 center -> centre (BE)

Section 3: The ILC Environment

This section was straightforward and in good shape

Page 5.
L7 inital -> initial
Table 3.1 should also have the beam size in z at the IP that is a fairly important parameter for
the experiment.
L13 space after \approx

Page 6.
right->right section. Maybe invert the right/left description to left/right which is more natural.
(Also these details might be better in the figure caption).
L5. period after 6.1.3

Page 7.
L21/22. "colliding detectors" doesn't make much sense. -> "experimental programme".

L23 High luminosity -> High instantaneous luminosity.
L23 cms -> cms energy   (or maybe better to define $\sqrt{s}$)
L24 Polarisation -> Longitudinal polarisation.   (I know that transverse is also feasible … but probably best to make it explicit as longitudinal).

Page 8.
L2 c.f.table -> c.f. Table   (add space)
L3 You mention TDR here, probably best then on page 5, L6
-> "upgradable to 1 TeV in the ILC TDR [5]." to have first defined it.
Fig 3.4. GuinePig -> GuineaPig
L8 e bunches -> electron and positron bunches
L10 still needs to be fixed / rephrased
L13 it reads as if the pairs are simply coming from standard photon conversions in material rather than spontaneous conversion in the strong electromagnetic fields associated with the beams. - need to rephrase a bit. Maybe they are best called "beamstrahlung pairs" and one refers
to one of the early works by for example Chen, or is this coherent beamstrahlung pair only an issue in the CLIC regime??
L15 sources sources -> sources
L20 this is the first mention of SiD. I wonder whether we need some more general information in the introduction that puts things in the historical context of the LoI process, and the "validation" of ILD and SiD. Maybe one could simply change
"the other proposed detector for the ILC" to "the other detector currently proposed for the ILC".
L23 ILC and SiD -> currently envisaged as ILD and SiD   (Note ILC -> ILD !)

(We also need to stay open to new ideas / detector concepts rather than be a closed club …)

L24 on detector -> one detector

Page 9
L1 suggest: turn-over -> turn-around
L3 have been -> has been
L9 lenghts -> lengths
L14 study on -> study of

Why no page 10?

Section 4: ILD Concept

No major comments. In good shape.

Page 11
Figure 4.1 might be better after the initial paragraph.

Fig 4.1: X_{0} not X^{0}.
The figure is nice.

L3 subdetectors performances -> performance of the subdetectors
L7 "conversion electron pairs". See remark above on L13 of S3. Maybe there is a better way to phrase this.
L8 to the -> for the
L9 into -> of
L10 conditions to -> conditions on
L15 EW -> electroweak
L16 its decays -> Higgs decay mode
L18 "demand" sounds like an economic term ;-)   Rephrase?
L19 flavors -> flavours (BE)

Page 12
Figure caption "Iso-cost" -> "iso-cost"
L2 crowdy -> crowded
L3 as -> than
L6 scheme -> scheme,
L7 simpler if one says
"requires the calorimeters to be positioned inside the coil."
L15 where -> were
L16/17 as function as -> as a function of
L17 They show -> This shows
L21 limited to 2 -> limited to two
L24 to DBD -> to the DBD
L25 parameters evolutions -> parameter evolution

Page 13
L1 constrains -> constraints
L4 level-arm to the comparisons -> lever arm for the comparison.
L6 as CLICdp -> to CLICdp
L10 calorimeters depths -> calorimeter depths
L11 calorimeters radius -> calorimeter radii
L13 level-arm -> lever arm

Section 7: Physics and Detector Modelling

No major comments. In good shape.

Page 87
L13. My understanding is that the standard generator samples do not include loop corrections.
L22 are -> is

L22/23 Thse type of events -> This type of event is
L23 300 MeV 2 Gev -> 300 MeV to 2 GeV
Table 7.1 caption. hadron -> hadrons
Table would probably look better if the first column was centered, and the others right justified.
I think the WB and BW cross sections are identical so you should probably put 0.245 expected
events per BX for both.

Page 88
Fig 7.1 It should be made clear whether the log is base 10 or base e. I would expect it to be
ln if base e. In general it is better to include the base subscript. Here at least clarify this in the
caption.
Fig 7.1 caption. extend -> extent

Page 89
L12 reminder -> remainder

Page 90
L1. So does the spike go even higher than displayed? Naively the y-axis should be chosen
so that this is not suppressed.

Fig 7.3 caption. inner -> the inner
Radiation length can be expressed as a mass per unit area (g / cm^2) or as
a length for a given assumed density. So saying inverse X0 is a bit confusing ….
Might be better to figure out how to not use arbitrary units.

Fig 7.4 right. This does not explain at all what is plotted. Is it the energy weighted average
longitudinal layer? What kind of particles is it for?

7.2.2 It is probably a good idea to make it clear here that this is for both the ECAL and the
HCAL.
The example is just for the HCAL.

Page 91
L7 strip-and -> strip and
L18 Birk's Law -> Birks' Law (he was called Birks not Birk).
L20 neighboring -> neighbouring (BE).

Page 92
L3 suggest easier to parse if one says
"followed by an inwards road search based on a Kalman filter"
Footnote 1 "PandorPFA" -> "PandoraPFA".
Muon system -> muon system
L29 input -> inputs

L30 the applied -> then applied
L31 optimizing th -> optimizing the
L31 the momentum-energy consistency -> momentum-energy consistency

Page 93
L7 Leptons -> leptons
L9 flavor -> flavour (BE)
L10 the Fastjet -> Fastjet
L12 flavor -> flavour (BE)
L13 palette does not seem like the right word in a scientific document.
Suggest palette -> variety
L27 managable -> manageable
L32 GEANT4 gateway -> GEANT4-based   ?   (gateway is a bit weird).
L39 effect reducing -> effect of reducing

Page 94
Table 7.3 caption. About same number -> Similar numbers
-> the large and small simulation models.
Sum of -> The sum of the
Not sure what 6f(WW) means. WW is 4 fermion not 6 fermion. Is it ff WW?

Section 10: SUMMARY
Maybe should try more to summarize what is actually in the document.
I have not read it all yet so don't have too many specific suggestions.

Page 141
L5 suggest
   "of an intense effort" -> "of the work".   (the intensity has been less than intense by many of
the signees of this document !)
L6 that we are -> where we are
L7 if engineering -> of engineering
L12 R& D -> R&D (remove space)
L12 collaborations the ILD -> collaborations and ILD
L16 both in transverse and in the longitudinal direction -> in both the transverse and longitudinal
directions
L22 have been shown -> has been shown   (readiness is singular).
L22 is been -> has been
L24 build -> built
L36 the potential -> the physics potential
L38 Ref [146] is NOT the science case for ILC !