Required Fix:

- Derive explicit convergence rate under strong convexity (e.g., exponential rate)
- Analyze discretization error for practical implementation
- Compare iteration complexity with ADMM, subgradient, cutting plane methods
- Provide computational complexity comparison table

5) **Assumptions are Overly Restrictive**
Location: Assumption 1 (lines 257-260), Assumption 2 (lines 267-276), Assumption 3 (lines 327-329)
Problem:
Assumption 1: Requires $f_0(x, u_0)$ strictly convex in x for ANY u_0, and C^1 with locally Lipschitz gradients.
Fails for:
   - Affine costs: $\min c^\top x$ (NOT strictly convex)
   - Non-smooth uncertainty: $\|u\|_\infty \leq 1$
   - Practical applications: portfolio optimization with linear returns, hinge loss, ℓ_1 penalties

   Assumption 2 (Slater): Requires strict feasibility for BOTH levels.
   Fails for:
   - Boundary-active problems ($x \geq 0$ constraints at optimum)
   - Polyhedral uncertainty sets (no strict interior for lower-dimensional faces)
   - Equality constraints (Slater never holds)

   Assumption 3: Requires $c_i > 0$ but gives NO guidance except "use 10^{-6}" (line 332).
   Critical questions unanswered:
   - How to choose c_i for specific problems?
   - How does c_i affect convergence rate?
   - Section VI proves convergence as $c_i \to 0$, but how fast? $\mathcal{O}(c_i)$? $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{c_i})$?

   Required Fix:
   - Provide examples where assumptions hold/fail
   - Discuss alternative constraint qualifications (MFCQ, LICQ, Abadie)
   - Give practical parameter selection guidance
   - Analyze convergence rate dependence on c_i

MODERATE ISSUES (Require Major Revision)

resume

1) **Lyapunov Function Construction is Not Novel**
Location: Lemma 3 (lines 571-640)
Problem: The Lyapunov function (Equation 28) is a **standard weighted quadratic** for primal-dual systems. The only modification is using $\lambda_i^\star$ (optimal dual) instead of λ_i in weights. Arrow-Hurwicz-Uzawa (1958) and Feijer & Paganini (2010) used nearly identical constructions.
Required Fix: Clearly state what IS novel (if anything), compare with existing constructions in a table.
2) **Simulations Lack Rigor**
Example A (Lines 1019-1084):
   - Compares with 15-year-old scenario method [Calafiore 2004]
   - Compares with CVX but doesn't report CVX's solution time
   - Claims "exact solution" but shows 4-decimal agreement
   - No integration time, number of steps, or tolerance settings reported

   Example B (Lines 1086-1120):
   - Claims "no closed-form RC exists" without thorough literature search
   - Unfair comparison: CVX solves 1000 QPs exactly; ODE solver integrates with unknown accuracy
   - No error bounds on ODE solution

   Example C (Lines 1122-1176):
   - No quantitative results (just qualitative description)
   - No comparison with ANY baseline
   - Real-time tracking claim unsupported (no time-varying experiment)

   Critical Omissions:
   - No large-scale examples ($n > 2$ dimensions!)
   - No comparison with modern RO solvers (Mosek, Gurobi RO extensions)
   - No comparison with recent methods: ADMM [Rostampour 2021], ROOT [Yazdani 2023]