

made some new endings

?

14. Page 15, paragraph before Remark 4: Please either remove this comment or make it more precise. It is hard to get something from it in the current form.

15. Page 15, Remark 4: If you claim the results in infinite-dimensions, then proofs are required. It is not entirely obvious (and if it were, then why not state and prove the results in that generality to start with)?

I ignored this

16. Page 17, top: The sentence "Nonetheless, all our results appropriately viewed continue to hold" is too vague — please provide the appropriate formulations. (It is clear that almost any mathematical result will allow for some "appropriate generalization" but perhaps different readers will have different thoughts on what these results would be.)

that's what we don't

17. Page 17, second paragraph: The set defining A_0 misses a " \cap "; moreover, it is not clear what $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are.

($\cap a$)

new ending

18. Page 17, second paragraph: It is more clear to write " $Q_{x_0} = A_0^\perp + \mathbb{R}x_0$ ".

19. Page 17, first and second paragraph: In the first paragraph you speak of the feasible points no longer being isolated, whereas in the second paragraph, you give two isolated point? Please clarify.

20. Page 17: I do not think that the extension of your results from a line to a general finite-dimensional affine subspace is routine. If you claim the results, please provide proofs. Otherwise, please formulate as conjectures.

we effectively have.