



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors introduce the notion of cofinitely g-supplemented module and show that this notion is preserved under quotients and homomorphic images. They also show that the notion is equivalent to amply cofinitely g-supplemented modules. Finally, they obtain that perprojective g-supplemented modules are amply supplemented module. I recommend the paper for publication with the following minor corrections listed below.	Thank you for considering my manuscript and for the opportunity to submit a revision. I would also like to thank to the reviewer her/his supportive comments, insights and suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In Lemma 1.1, item (3), in "$f(K) \leq_g M$", replace M by N. In Section 3, I am not sure if "ample" module is defined before. It is easier for reader if you recall the notion of ample module before Definition 3.1	I have revised the manuscript according to referee's suggestions and made required changes.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		