**Decision:** Revise and resubmit.

*Reviewer 1*

ACCEPTANCE (scale 1-5):

[ ] Accept as written  
[ ] Minor revision  
[x] Major revision (needs re-review)  
[ ] Reject (unsuitable for publication)  
[ ] Transfer to more suitable publication  
  
GENERAL EVALUATION:3  
(1: excellent; 5: bad)  
  
DETAILED EVALUATION: 3  
(1: completely agree/true; 5: disagree/false)  
  
Is the topic relevant to TDP? Yes  
Does the paper make a valuable contribution? Yes-ish  
Is the paper deep? No  
  
Is the presentation good (clarity and organization)? Yes  
Is the language acceptable? Yes  
Is the title appropriate? Yes, although they claim in the abstract to be  
more general than just localization data  
Is the abstract appropriate? Not quite - the paper is an example of how  
you might approach it, but doesn't give the step-by-step guide it promises  
Are the references appropriate? Yes

TYPE OF PAPER:  
  
[ ] Research paper  
[x] Application paper  
[ ] Other (please specify):  
  
- Technical soundness:  
[ ] Technically correct (after careful check)  
[X] Apparently correct (after superficial check)  
[ ] Minor errors (please indicate them)  
[ ] Major errors (please indicate them)  
[ ] Unsupported claims  
  
- For applications and methods analysis:  
[ ] Conclusive analysis  
[x] Real world problems  
[ ] Toy problems  
[ ] Application description (no experiments described)  
  
Are the experiments explained with enough detail? Yes  
  
Can an interested reader reproduce the experiments? Yes, if given access to  
the data  
  
REMARKS TO BE FORWARDED TO THE AUTHORS  
(please indicate here what needs to be revised).  
  
OVERALL PERSPECTIVE  
  
This is a clear summary of the legal and practical context of  
anonymization, some analysis of what GDPR regulations might mean  
statistically, and a case study applying those statistics to a specific  
case. It provides a useful example of the compromises necessary in  
practical anonymisation. However, the statistical analysis is both overly  
complicated and missing some important elements. Ultimately, this analysis  
all comes down to "have 2 or more observations on each unique set of  
identifiers, plus look at class disclosure" - I'm not sure that this is  
needed section 4 to come to this conclusion, although the actual applied  
work is of value. So, I think this is a useful addition to the literature,  
but the middle section needs substantial revision.

*Reviewer 2*

ACCEPTANCE:  
[X] Minor revision  
  
GENERAL EVALUATION:3  
  
DETAILED EVALUATION: 3  
  
Is the topic relevant to TDP? Yes  
Does the paper make a valuable contribution? Ok  
Is the paper deep? No  
  
Is the presentation good (clarity and organization)? 3  
Is the language acceptable? 3  
Is the title appropriate? 3  
Is the abstract appropriate? 4  
Are the references appropriate? 3  
  
  
TYPE OF PAPER:  
  
[X] Research paper  
[X] Application paper  
  
- Technical soundness:  
[X] Apparently correct (after superficial check)  
  
- For applications and methods analysis:  
[X] Real world problems