



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_10668
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF PARTICULAR MEASURES
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper reviewed the constructions of some specific measures based on the Carathéodory extension theorem and the Carathéodory-Hahn theorem. However, this topic has been clearly presented in Chapter 20 and 21 in book, 'Real analysis, 4 th edition' by Royden and Fitzpatrick. It is a good note and conclusion for understanding of these two chapters, but not an article for publication.	We have brought a few things to light and so the paper merits to be published.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>(1) The authors did not use references [1, 2, 5-11, 14, 16, 18] that listed in the references' page.</p> <p>(2) Some concepts appeared in this paper were undefined such as measurable space in page 4 and semiring in page 5.</p> <p>(3) The notations, A and B, were used without definition in the part of Product Measure in page 6. Moreover, the condition, 'If $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we call $A \times B$ a measurable rectangle.' in page 6, is not enough to define the measurable rectangle. It should be added with '$\mu(A)$ and $\nu(B)$ are finite' which can be found in the errata/comments of book 'Real analysis, 4th edition'.</p>	<p>(1). They were cited in the larger project though, we have remedied the situation.</p> <p>(2) We have made the necessary corrections.</p> <p>(3) We have read the errata/comments, but we believe that the imposition that '$\mu(A)$ and $\nu(B)$ are finite' is an unnecessary/pre-emptive one. [1],[2],[3],[7],[6] and [13] in their constructions only impose that the two reference measure spaces be σ-finite and even that imposition is made when they begin to consider the Fubini and Tonelli theorems. In [1], the assumption that one of the measures was finite was a convenient step in the proof of the lemma preceding Tonelli's theorem.</p>
Optional/General comments		