DETAILED SUB-COMMENT ASSESSMENT

The following table provides a granular breakdown of how each sub-component of every reviewer comment was addressed:

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	Not	Need explicit O(·) convergence rate bounds or numerical rate estimates
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5	18	Ref [22] techniques outdated, need SOTA	Addressed	None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
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

(continued on next page)