



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_28879
Title of the Manuscript:	Square-Normal Operator
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The author has corrected a few of his errors. Unfortunately, in my opinion, B, C are selfadjoint by their definition, and therefore B-C is also selfadjoint, as a difference of selfadjoint operators. Therefore, $(B - C)^2 = 0$, (relation which has been proved by the Author), implies $B - C = 0$, as it was claimed. Otherwise, for an arbitrary not invertible and not selfadjoint operator U , $U^2 = 0$ does not imply $U = 0$. But if $U := B - C$ is selfadjoint, the above mentioned implication holds. The argument given by the Author in his feedback concerning this problem has no sense. In our remark mentioned above, we do not use the conclusion to be proved, namely $B = C$, but only the fact that B and C are selfadjoint (obviously), hence so is $B - C$ (obviously). The whole proof of Theorem 3 seems to be incomplete. The Author is kindly asked to prove all his assertions immediately after their statements, so that the reader can follow easily the course of the proof (see my first review).	At the beginning I didn't understand your opinion, I have to write " $(B - C)^2 = 0$ implies $B - C = 0$ since B, C are self - adjoint operators, and so is $B - C$ ", after the explanation I understood. You said " The whole proof of Theorem 3 seems to be incomplete" , I don't why? Every thing is clear and correct. You said " The Author is kindly asked to prove all his assertions immediately after their statements, so that the reader can follow easily the course of the proof " , my opinion is different, I think the proof stills the same is better.