SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJMCS_27209**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Pseudo Lifting 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	1) In the abstract, in line 4, the reference of K.Oshiro is uncorrect. In the same line 'We call a sub module N...' must be 'We call a submodule N....'. 2) In the abstract, lines 4 and 5 must be extracted in the abstract and these sentences must be put in the introduction. 3) In keywords line 7, In page 3, lines 12,13,14,15,20,27 'Semi simple...' must be 'Semi-simple....'. 4) In the introduction, in line 9, '... if for every sub module ' must be '...if for every submodule...'. 5) Definition of a pseudo stable submodule must be added in the end of the introduction, in page 1 line 13. 6) The definitions of direct summand and small submodule must be added in the introduction. 7) In the line 15, definition 2.1, the concept of 'pseudo lifting module' must be written italic format. Because this sentence is a definition. 8) Lemma 2 and line 24 must be deleted . In page 2, line 7, proof of Theorem 3 , 'By the modular law...' must be 'by the modular law...'. 9) In page 2, line 11, 'we are done ...' must be 'the proof is concluded....'. 10) In page 2, the proof of the Theorem 4, the spelling 'sub module' is wrong. This must be 'submodule'. 11) In page 3, proposition 5, the reference is wrong. The reference of this Lemma must be 'R. Wisbauer, 1991, Foundations of Modules and Rings. Gordon and	The points raised by the reviewer are now sorted out according to the reviewer's comments. Some parts had to be rephrased and modified. The numbering have changed. References are now set in alphabetical order. Some new references are added. The reviewer recommended to remove Lemma 2 (which is now called Lemma 2.1). However this lemma is used in the proof of Theorem 2.2. So it is left as it is. It is intended to generalised this paper in the near future. So nothing else was mentioned

	Breach.' 12) In page 3, Remark 6 is unnecessary. 13) In page 3, line 12 '(nation J(M))' must be 'notion J(M)'. 14) In page 4, line 4, 'we are done if we can show…' must be 'the proof is concluded if we can show…'. 15) The references must be aligned as surname. 16) 'R. Wisbauer, 1991, Foundations of Modules and Rings. Gordon and Breach.' Is added in the references. **As a result, in this article must be executed for a generalization of lifting modules. But the consequences aren't sufficient. The proofs of theorems are developed. This manuscript has been developed.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		