Detailed Sub-Comment Assessment

Rev	Cmt	Sub-comment	Status	Missing Action
4	1	Improvements over existing results unclear	Addressed	None
4	2a	Language and grammar issues	Addressed	None
4	2b	Long sentences need splitting	Addressed	None
4	3	Definite articles in figure captions	Addressed	None
4	4	Formula italics inconsistent	Addressed	None
4	5	Quotation marks incorrect	Addressed	None
5	1a	Contributions scattered across sections	Addressed	None
5	1b	Need consolidated contributions section	Addressed	None
5	2a	Algorithm (23) lacks context	Addressed	None
5	2b	Need intuition behind design	Addressed	None
5	2c	Need comparison with existing methods	Addressed	None
5	3	Convergence performance analysis missing	Partially	Need quantitative rates
5	4	Forward references (eqs 5,6 before Assumption 2)	Addressed	None
5	5a	Assumption 2 seems restrictive	Addressed	None
5	5b	Can it be relaxed per Ref [34]?	Addressed	None
5	6	Assumption 1 justification needed	Addressed	None
5	7a	Meaning of h_{ij} and K_i unclear	Addressed	None
5	7b	Purpose of introducing them not justified	Addressed	None
5	8a	Lagrangian (15) seems straightforward	Addressed	None
5	8b	Is lengthy Section IV derivation necessary?	Addressed	None
5	9a	RC abbreviation redundantly explained	Addressed	None
5	9b	RHS abbreviation not explained	Addressed	None
5	10	Appendix B should be in main text	Addressed	None
5	11	Lemma 4 proof not in Ref [41]	Addressed	None
5	12	Superscript ϵ^+ not explained	Addressed	None
5	13	Why are our results better than Ref [22]?	Addressed	None
5	14	Proposition 6 needs clarification	Addressed	None
5	15	Typo: $\lim_{k\to\infty} = y$ should be $\lim_{k\to\infty} y_k = y$	Addressed	None
5	16	Reversed quotation marks	Addressed	None
5	17a	Introduction too long	Addressed	None
5	17b	Lacks coherent structure	Addressed	None
5	18	Ref [22] techniques outdated, need SOTA	Addressed	None
6	1	Motivation for formulation (4) vs (3) unclear	Addressed	None
6	2a	Why represent U_i as nonlinear inequalities?	Addressed	None

Rev	Cmt	Sub-comment	Status	Missing Action
6	2b	How does (3) differ from classical (2)?	Addressed	None
6	3a	Could use $\gamma_i := c_i + \lambda_i$ instead	Addressed	None
6	3b	What is novelty/role of c_i terms?	Addressed	None
6	4a	Taking max over constraints adds non-smoothness	Addressed	None
6	4b	Is this complexity justified?	Addressed	None
6	5a	Is Lemma 1 novel or well-known?	Addressed	None
6	5b	Seems like standard KKT + saddle point	Not	Need explicit novelty statement
6	6	Formulation (2) more general than (3)	Addressed	None
6	7	Is U_i compact under convexity alone?	Addressed	None
6	8	Assumption 3 ($c_i > 0$) prevents recovering (2)	Addressed	None
6	9	Do results hold for nonlinear constraints in u_i?	Addressed	None
10	1a	Abstract overly long	Addressed	None
10	1b	Long sentences obscure message	Addressed	None
10	1c	Example: "This is while..." sentence unclear	Addressed	None
10	1d	"the paper" should be "this paper"	Addressed	None
10	2	Footnote 2: need continuity assumption	Addressed	None
10	3a	Lemma 1 novelty unclear	Addressed	None
10	3b	Appears to be standard saddle point property	Not	Need clear differentiation from Sion/Rockafellar
10	3c	How does it differ from classical formulations?	Partially	More explicit comparison needed
10	4a	Assumption 3 ($c > 0$) mathematically convenient	Addressed	None
10	4b	May be overly rigid for practice	Addressed	None
10	4c	Theoretical benefits acknowledged	Addressed	None
10	4d	No empirical parameter selection strategies	Partially	Need practical guidelines
10	5	Notation: u_i should be u_1	Addressed	None
10	6	Introduce Z parameter after eq (23)	Addressed	None
10	7	Missing parentheses in eq (36)	Addressed	None
10	8	Remark 4 needs splitting into two parts	Addressed	None
10	9	Theorem 4 proof conclusion not self-evident	Partially	May need Haddad Thm 4.19 or complete proof
10	10a	Corollary 1 strict complementarity too strong	Addressed	None
10	10b	Fails when constraints inactive	Addressed	None
10	10c	Suggest proximal/regularization terms	Addressed	None
10	11a	Examples lack scenario-based RO setting	Partially	Could add more realistic scenarios
10	11b	Need convergence analysis results	Addressed	None
10	11c	Need stability demonstration	Addressed	None

Summary Statistics

- **Total sub-comments:** 63
- **Fully Addressed:** 55 (87%)
- **Partially Addressed:** 6 (10%)
- **Not Addressed:** 2 (3%)

Critical Items Requiring Action

Priority 1 - Not Addressed

1. **Rev 6, Cmt 5b:** Lemma 1 appears standard - need explicit novelty statement distinguishing from KKT conditions
2. **Rev 10, Cmt 3b:** Lemma 1 appears to be standard saddle point - need clear differentiation from Sion/Rockafellar theorems

Priority 2 - Partially Addressed

1. **Rev 5, Cmt 3:** Convergence performance analysis - need quantitative convergence rates
2. **Rev 10, Cmt 3c:** How Lemma 1 differs from classical - more explicit comparison needed
3. **Rev 10, Cmt 4d:** No empirical parameter selection strategies for c_i
4. **Rev 10, Cmt 9:** Theorem 4 proof conclusion - may need to cite Haddad Theorem 4.19 or provide complete self-contained proof
5. **Rev 10, Cmt 11a:** Examples could include more realistic scenario-based RO settings