(continued from previous page)

Rev	Cmt	Sub-comment	Status	Missing Action
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?	Partially	Remark claims novelty but only distinguishes from Sion/Rockafellar, not from standard convex opt textbooks
6	5b	Seems like standard KKT + saddle point	Partially	Remark explains non-standard structure vs Sion/Rockafellar, but doesn't explicitly address why KKT⇔saddle point equivalence differs from Boyd 5.9.1
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	Partially	Same as 6.5a - remark distinguishes from Sion/Rockafellar but not from standard theory
10	3b	Appears to be standard saddle point property	Partially	Same as 6.5b - remark addresses Sion/Rockafellar but not KKT⇔saddle point from Boyd
10	3c	How does it differ from classical formulations?	Partially	Same as 6.5b - need explicit comparison with standard convex opt theory
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	Not	Only suggests generic $c_i = 10^{-6}$; no problem-specific strategies, scaling guidance, or constraint-dependent selection
10	5	Notation: u_i should be u_1	Addressed	None
10	6	Introduce Z parameter after eq (23)	Addressed	None

(continued on next page)