Review of: "An Analysis of the Continuum Hypothesis"

Octav Olteanu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Report on the revised version of the manuscript entitled *An Analysis of the Continuum Hypothesis*

The aim of the present article is to recall, discuss and mainly support the idea that CH is a reasonable axiom to assert, from several points of view. This is clearly written in the Abstract and in the Conclusions section. This idea is supported by Propositions and reference citations. It is an interesting and well-organized article, in an important area of study. The Author has partially revised and improved the first version of this paper.

Here are a few comments and suggestions referring to further improvement of the presentation of the paper, the author should take into consideration.

1. P.2: The way of writing in the manuscript, namely:$(x < y) \vee (x = y) \vee (y > x)$ is not appropriate, since $x < y$ is equivalent to $y > x$, hence the first relation is repeated as the last one. If we want to express the definition of *linearly ordered* set X without using words, we should write:
   "$\forall x, y \in X: (x < y) \vee (x = y) \vee (y < x)$ or "$\forall x, y \in X: (x < y) \vee (x = y) \vee (x > y)$".
2. P.2: The second Definition: It should be: "A well-ordered set is a totally ordered set X such that for any nonempty subset
   $Y \subseteq X, (\exists z \in Y)(\forall y \in Y)(z < y) \vee (z = y)$".
3. P.4: The significance of the notations ω^1 and ω_1 should be recalled.

Octav Olteanu