Response to Reviewers

Adaptive Monitoring for Shared Services

Author Name author@example.org

15 September 2026

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you for the careful reading of our manuscript. We have answered every comment below and marked manuscript changes by section and page number.

Comment 1.1

The evaluation does not explain why the selected workload represents a shared service rather than a single application.

Response

We agree that the workload description was too brief. We added a paragraph in Section 3.1 defining the tenant mix, request proportions and burst profile. The revised experiment uses three independently generated tenant streams and reports both aggregate and per-tenant tail latency.

Comment 1.2

Please report uncertainty rather than only the median improvement.

Response

We added bootstrap 95% confidence intervals to Table 2 and describe the resampling procedure in Section 3.3. The headline comparison is unchanged, but the new interval makes clear where the effect is inconclusive.

Comment 2.1

The conclusion appears to claim that the method is safe for every workload.

Response

We softened that claim. The conclusion now limits the result to workloads with the measured burst and tenant characteristics, and lists cold-start behaviour as an explicit limitation and future experiment.

Change summary

- Section 3.1: workload and tenant definition, pages 5–6.
- Section 3.3: bootstrap interval procedure, page 7.

- Table 2: uncertainty columns, page 9.
- Conclusion: scoped claim and limitation, page 11.

Sincerely,

Author Name