



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_26697
Title of the Manuscript:	COFINITELY G-SUPPLEMENTED MODULES
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	This manuscript consists of original research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript matter is interesting. But I recommend general comments of these manuscript. 1) In the introduction, all of the concepts in the definition must be italic form. For example, M/N is finitely generated for $N \leq M$, then N is called a <i>cofinite submodule</i> of M. 2) In the introduction in line -11, 'Let M be an R-module and $T \leq M$. If $K=0, \dots$' must be 'Let M be an R-module and a <i>non-zero submodule T of M</i>. If $K=0, \dots$' 3) In the statements of Lemma 1.1 must be (see [13], [15]) <i>Let M be an R-module....</i> 4) In the statements of Lemmas 1.2 and 1.3 must be (see [5]) <i>Let M be an R-module....</i> 5) The satatement of Definition 2.1 could be given as 'Let M be an R-module. M is called a <i>cofinitely g-supplemented module</i> if every cofinite submodule of M has a g-supplement in M. ' 6) In the proof of Proposition 2.5, page 3, line 9, by Lemma1.1 and Lemma 1.2,... must be by Lemma 1.2, $U \cap V \leq \text{Rad}_g M$ 7) In the proof Lemma 2.6, line 13,must be '.... also a cofinite submodule of M by the isomorphism	Thanks for the comments. Suggestions 1,3-4-8 are considered and suggested corrections were made in the revised manuscript. For comments 2, I oppose to reviewer's suggestion because the case T being zero does not have to be eliminated.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	$\frac{\frac{M}{U}}{\frac{U+X}{U}} \cong \frac{M}{U+X}$. 8) The statements of Definition 3.1 could be given as 'Let M be an R-module. M is called an <i>amply cofinitely g-supplemented module</i>, if every cofinite submodule of M has ample g-supplements in M.' 9) In the proof of Proposition 3.8, line-13, $(g) \Rightarrow (i)$ must be Since every R-module is generated by R, clear from Corollary 2.4. 10) The references [6],[7],[8],[9],[10],[11] certainly remove because these papers aren't relevant. [6] C. Lomp, On Semilocal Modules and Rings, Communications in Algebra, 27 No. 4, 1921-1935 (1999). [7] Celil Nebiyev, Amply Weak Supplemented Modules, International Journal of Computational Cognition, 3 No. 1, 88-90 (2005). [8] Celil Nebiyev and Hasan Hüseyin Ökten, Weakly G-Supplemented Modules, European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics (Accepted). [9] C. Nebiyev and A. Pancar, Cofinitely Injective and Projective Modules, Hacettepe Journal of Mathematics and Statistics, 39 No. 2, 171-182 (2010). [10] C. Nebiyev and A. Pancar, On Strongly $\oplus$-Supplemented Modules, Ukrainian Mathematical Journal, 63 No. 5, 662-667 (2011). [11] C. Nebiyev and A. Pancar, On Supplement Submodules, Ukrainian Mathematical Journal, 65 No. 7, 961-966 (2013).	
--	--	--