



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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Overall, the paper is well written. The results are stated clearly, and the proofs are performed thoroughly. The conditions on modules (ms^* -modules) are relevant in view that they generalize well-known properties of modules (locality and semisimplicity).	Thank you for your suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The logical connector 'if and only if' is typically not employed in definitions. Please, remove them from your definitions.	We remove the connector "if and only if" in definition 2.1.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My only concern is that the paper belongs to the field of module theory (which is an area of pure mathematics) and the journal emphasizes papers on applied science. In my opinion, the paper is sound and interesting.	