**To Do For Resubmission**

* Emphasize how my method reduces complexity compared to manual tuning approaches, possibly by quantifying the reduction in effort or demonstrating its efficiency. I could mention the need to either try different manually chosen parameter combinations (which you might know the right direction of tuning but not necessarily the magnitude) or try a brute-force approach, testing a bunch of different combinations. However, we tried two different seeds in the optimizer, each of which reached relatively good solutions in only 25 iterations. It is unlikely that 25 randomly chosen parameter combinations would produce results that were comparable.
* While the editor thought that results were dependent on the choices of metrics, models, and criteria, we used similar modeling choices for each data set and were able to achieve good results on each one. We propose that data stewards could use these as reasonable values, and further research could be done to compare alternative choices.
* Revise abstract, introduction, and discussion sections to clearly illustrate contributions. Include a diagram or decision tree to illustrate the current synthesis process vs. the optimized synthesis process
* Acknowledge that the results depend on chosen metrics and models, but that this is a necessary feature of data synthesis. Furthermore, our tuning method provides a better starting point for the synthesis process than just randomly choosing a set of parameters for your synthesis model(s).
* Note in the contributions in the paper (introduction and conclusions) that we showed that commonly used synthesis models can produce legally anonymous synthetic data