

For our purposes
 S and L

are the only two
 closed sets AND they are

isolated

isn't it?

couldn't find

8. Page 9, to: In general, $S \cap L$ is only a subset of the set of fixed points of $T_{S,L}$. While in your setting it is clear that here $S \cap L$ is unique in the positive open halfspace, it is not clear to me why the set of fixed points of $T_{S,L}$ is unique there. So I don't see why you can speak of an "isolated fixed point of $T_{S,L}$ " without further justification.

9. Page 9, line +4: Please replace ". Then" by ". Then".

isn't it clear from from $T_{S,L}$?

10. Page 10, Theorem 2: In what sense do you use the adjective "critical" here? Presumably not in the sense of having-gradients-equal-to-zero, in which case it is more clear to delete "critical".

11. Page 14. top, regarding the following

$$x_{n+1}(2) - 1 = x_n(2)(1 - 1/\rho_n) > 1.0$$

- (a) Should the last "1" be "0"?
- (b) If so, why is $x_n(2) > 0$? I don't see this. Is it part of the assumption on the starting point, i.e., $x_0(2) > 0$. If so, Theorem 4 on that page needs to be modified accordingly.

12. Page 14. Theorem 5:

- (a) Replace " $h > 1$ " by " $a > 1$ ".
- (b) "Initial point $x_n(2)$ ": $x_n(2)$ is not a point to me, but rather a coordinate of one. Also "initial" suggests $n = 0$?
- (c) In fact, I don't think you need to assume anything on $x_n(2)$.
- (d) The statement is confusing to me: "divergence at an(?) at least linear rate" suggests to me that the *quotient* is bigger than 1. In the proof, it becomes clear that you mean the *difference* of consecutive iterates. Why not state the inequality and remove any ambiguity?
- (e) In the proof, replace " $> \alpha - 1$ as $x_n(2) < \rho_n$ " by " $\geq \alpha - 1$ as $x_n(2) \leq \rho_n$ " which shows that nothing has to be assumed about $x_n(2)$ in the statement.

13. Page 15. Section 6, fourth paragraph, "all non-zero points on this line remain fixed under $T_{S,L}$ ": This is not correct, it is only true for all points of the form λb , where $\lambda > 0$, due to the evaluation of $\|\lambda b\|$.

to avoid the mean interpolation made here

rounded but didn't

but those are correct as assumption is made as $x_0(2)$.