Dear Referee,

We thank you very much for your careful reading of our paper “Differential stability of convex optimization problems under inclusion constraints”. Upon your insightful remarks and suggestions, we have revised our paper throughout.

Let us report in detail the changes.

➤ *Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3 should merge into one theorem. Note that the proof of Theorem 4.3 can be much more shorten in the following way:*

Observe that $x \in \text{dom} \mu \Leftrightarrow \mu(x) < \infty \Leftrightarrow \exists y \in G(x) : (x, y) \in \text{dom} \phi$.

Thus

$\delta(x; \text{dom} \mu) = \inf \{ \delta((x, y); \text{dom} \phi) : y \in G(x) \}$.

Applying Theorem 4.2 to the optimal value function $\delta(x; \text{dom} \mu)$ yields the desired conclusion.

- We have merged the two theorems to obtain Theorem 4.2 in the revised version. To prove the formula (4.6) for the singular subdifferential of μ , we have followed your idea.

➤ *2. Since two examples 4.1 and 4.2 seems to have the same effect, it suffices to use one example there. Moreover, the situation as indicated in the examples belongs to the settings of the results of Mordukhovich et al., I suggest that the objective function $\phi(x, y) = 0$ should replaced by some non-differentiable convex function (e.g., $\phi(x, y) = |x|$).*

- Examples 4.1 and 4.2 (revised, nonsmooth problems) were created on the basis of your remark and suggestion. Now each example has its own place: the first one is standard, the second one describes a situation where singular subdifferentials play a key role in the differential stability analysis.

➤ *3. The proof the known result of Lemma 5.2 is very familiar with the optimization community, and furthermore, a clearly geometrical proof of this result given in [1], the proof of Lemma 5.2 should be omitted.*

- We have deleted the proof of Lemma 5.3 (= Lemma 5.2 in the previous version).

➤ *4. No proof for the case (b) in Theorem 5.2 has been provided in the paper, the authors should supply it. Note that, if the case (b) is valid, then all $h_j, j = 1, \dots, k$ must be zero-functions.*

- We have split the former Theorem 5.2 into two separate theorems (new Theorems 5.1 and 5.2) and give a detailed proof for each of them. We think that the new presentation is much better.

➤ 5. *If X and Y are Banach spaces, then the condition (a) in Theorem 4.2 implies $\text{gph}G$ is SNC, while the condition (b) implies ϕ is SNEC; see [12, Theorem 1.21]. So, the claim that the SNC and the SNEC are no longer needed (in the abstract, introduction, so on) seems to be not absolutely correct.*

- Yes, it turns out that the SNC and SNEC properties are hidden in our assumptions. We have rewritten the comments. Thank you so much for pointing us our mistake.

➤ *Some misprint errors*

- 1) p. 9, l.17: $X \times R \rightarrow X \times Y \times R$;
- 2) p. 9, l.19 and l.21: *convex problem* *convex optimization problem*;
- 3) p. 11, l.11: *Féchet* *Fréchet*;
- 4) p. 11, l.32: $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph}M$ if...;
- 5) p. 17, l.5: "in" omitted;
- 6) p. 30, l.52–53: $f \rightarrow f^{**}$;
- 7) p. 31, tr. $\rightarrow p.$;
- 8) p. 32, l. 17: $\text{dom}G \rightarrow \text{dom}G^{-1}$.

- All the 8 misprints have been corrected.

We would like to thank you once again for your valuable remarks and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Duong Thi Viet An and Nguyen Dong Yen