



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31394
Title of the Manuscript:	MODULES WHOSE MAXIMAL SUBMODULES β^* EQUIVALENT TO A SUPPLEMENT
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>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	The author(s) convey(s) the equivalence relation β to supplement via maximal submodules. The manuscript can be accepted, but the author make a revision in the following statements. 1) The reference of notion of +-supplemented modules is given in the introduction. 2) It had better to delete section 2 (Properties of β^* relation) except for Proposition 2.6 and Proposition 2.7. Here, two propositions come in before Definition 3.1. 3) The proof of Proposition 3.8, line 19, 'By previous theorem....' must be 'By Theorem 3.7...' 4) The proof of Corollary 3.10, line 1, '... and previous Proposition...' must be '... and Proposition 3.9...' 5) Above Proposition 3.24, line -7, the notion of coatomic has a reference number [13]. In this definition, it would be rather that $Rad\left(\frac{M}{N}\right) = \frac{M}{N}$ implies $M=N$. 6) Hypothesis of Theorem 3.26 is deficient. So this Theorem must be proved clearly once again. 7) The proof of Proposition 3.27 is wrong. It must be proved again. 8) References [10] and [11] didn't be used in the tex anywhere. So author(s) must be either remove these references or verify the attribution. Ethical issue:	1) We add to introduction two references about +-supplemented modules. 2) We remove section 2 except for Proposition 2.6 and 2.7. 3-4-5) We correct them. 6) We try to write the proof clearly. 7) Proposition 3.27 is wrong, that's why, we delete it. 8) We add definition of maximally +-supplemented module after definition 3.11 and reference [12] is referred for this definition. Thank you for your suggestions.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Supplement, β^* relation, maximal submodule, ms^* -module	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		