Overall, I found the essay pleasant and informative. The task of summing up a great deal of history in a small amount of space is challenging and necessitates omissions. Though I did not read the main text of *Practical Curves* my understanding is that the selection of historical topics is based on what is treated there.

The two most substantial suggested revisions concern citations and the conclusion. First, the citations to primary sources are inconsistent. Some texts are cited fully, while for others only an author's last name is provided (e.g. von Staudt, Cauchy's review of Poncelet, BM 13901). Would recommend full citations to all primary sources referenced/consulted. Also note that some geometers are introduced with their full names provided, but not all of them.

Secondly, the essay (and hence the book) ends very abruptly. Having reached the Riemann-Roch theorem is there nothing more to say? Would it make any sense to briefly summarize the twentieth century? Or to wrap us up to the beginning of the textbook itself?

Some smaller suggestions/questions by page number.

p. 363 "to look at"

p. 364 "so-called Pythagorean theorem" ? since this reference does not involve transmission from Pythagoras?

"these would have been...lengths" --- it is not clear which is these and those here.

the last "He" is Apollonius and not Van der Waerden, right?

"Surviving sources suggest..." is this a reference to footnote 3?

p. 365, not sure of the relevance of the system of coordinates here

"although you can see him..." an example of this would be nice

"Islamic era" dates would be useful

"Iranian" should be "Iran"

where are pairs of conic sections necessary?

"In the West" is this specifically Western Europe? Or even more specifically the region that would become Italy?

p. 366 "and people said"? strange reference

Might be worth mentioning that Desargues does not use pole/polar language

p. 367

"It includes..." It = this idea or much of the early 19th century work in France?

p. 368

"visionary textbook" --- is Poncelet's Traité a textbook?

Source for Cauchy is missing

p. 369 "This led" This = Gergonne's vision?

reference to Plücker's work?

"weirdness" = ideal points

"in a long ..." --> "a long..."

source for Klein?

"ways round" the concept of negative length?

p. 370 curve in antiquity --- is this a reference to Apollonius?

p. 373

transition to cubics is somewhat abrupt and suggests Newton turned to cubics because he was annoyed by Descartes

"this" = the 72 types?

p. 374 "curves of higher degree" higher than degree 3?

Would it be possible to stick with Euler rather than to leave him and then return to him? The first citation to the second volume cites by section and the second citation cites by chapter.

p. 375, "this work" does this refer to the amount of labor involved or to a specific text?

At the end of the page, Abel and Jacobi are followed by the 18^{th} century, consider rearragnging.

"of that kind" --- what is kind here?

p. 376, presumably C and C* are dual?

Hesse citation?

p. 377 it is difficult to make out in the figure which is the curve under discussion.

"analysed how curves"

p. 378 source for "a version of what we all the Cauchy integral theorem" -

odd phrasing: "When did projective space come in, ..."

p. 379 does Plücker's confidence suggest he did not find it hard to accept complex coordinates?

p. 380 to me "devolved" sounds like an unwanted duty, though that's not strictly the definition so okay as is.

footnote 32, above up to where?

p. 381, presumably there is much more biographical information on Brill and Noether because they are more central to the above text.

p. 383, the section heading here means their collective text, right?