

Review of: "Horizon and curvature"

Magdalena Skrzypiec¹

¹ Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (MCSU)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject of the paper and the presented results are interesting. They are certainly worth further in-depth study. The drawings included in the second version of the work significantly improved its readability. It would be best if these were drawings prepared in a computer program. Geogebra might also be helpful here. If scans of freehand drawings are to remain in the work, it might be better to save them in .png rather than .jpg format to avoid blurring the contours during compression.

There are several formulas in this version of the paper that lack the mathematical mode (for example: "triangle ATC" on the bottom of page 2, captions of Figures 3, 4 and 7, "radius R" two times on page 7, points "C" and "B" on the bottom of page 7, "domain D" in the first line of the proof of Proposition 5.2, " $(x, f(x))$ " and " $(0, h)$ " between formulas (6,3) and (6,4), " $H(h)$ " in the first sentence of Section 7, "the height h" on the bottom of page 13, " $- 40^{\circ}\text{C}$ " in Subsection 8.5 - the sign minus is outside the math mode).

Other typos: to many ")" in " $A'=(x_3, y_3)$ " on page 7, "be be modified" in the subsection 8.4, shouldn't it be "Earth" instead of "earth" in the first sentence of 8.5? Missing dot at the end of 8.5.

Maybe it would be better to write "two points A and B in Γ " instead of " two points (A, B) in Γ " on page 7. Figure 7 should be cut more carefully. In the formula for S on page 9 spacing is missing in math mode. In Figure 7 it would be good to indicate which domain is D". In the second sentence of the proof of Proposition 7.1: did you mean that ω does not depend on the plane Π , or that it doesn't lie on that plane?