

1 We sincerely thank the four reviewers for their valuable feedback. We first discuss a few common concerns shared by
2 **reviewer 1**, **reviewer 2**, **reviewer 3** and **reviewer 4**.

3 •• **Non-convex bound:** empirical edge of the optimistic update but also a theoretical. Thanks for your constructive
4 comments. It is clear that in convex case a better prediction reduces the bound. In the non-convex case it holds as
5 well, with some careful analysis. For **H3**, if we alternatively consider $0 < m_t^T g_t = a \|g_t\|^2$ and $\|m_t\| \leq \|g_t\|$ (i.e. m_t
6 lies in the hemisphere with g_t as its midline), we can show that \tilde{C}_2 reaches minimum when $a = 1$ (i.e. $m_t = g_t$).
7 Also, \tilde{C}_1 is minimized at $a = 1$ under some conditions on the parameters (β_1, β_2 etc.). **That means the bound for**
8 **non-convex case is tighter when m_t predicts g_t well, similar to the convex analysis.** We will adjust our discussion
9 and presentation in the paper to address this point.

10 **Reviewer 1:** We thank the reviewer for valuable comments. Our point-to-point response is as follows:

11 **Convex regret bound:**

12 **Reviewer 2:** We thank the reviewer for valuable comments. A proofreading is being done we clarify that:

13 **Novelty of the contribution:**

14 **Reviewer 3:** We thank the reviewer for the thorough analysis. Our remarks are listed below:

15 **Gradient prediction algorithm:**