



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_5567
Title of the Manuscript:	On commutative EKFN-ring with ascending chain condition on annihilators.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(1) line 2: M satisfying $\longrightarrow$ M which satisfying (2) line 4: And let $\longrightarrow$ Let (3) line 5: It is known that ... is endo-notherian, ... , so $N \subset E \longrightarrow$ It is known that ... is endo-notherian, so $N \subset E$, but the converse is not true. Introduction, page 1: (1) initially identified $\longrightarrow$ which first defined footnote, page 1: (1) $\longrightarrow$ An I-ring R is a ring such that every hopfian R-module is Notherian (2) $\longrightarrow$ An S-ring R is a ring such that every co-hopfian R-module is Artinian page 3: (1) line 9: And then the characterization $\longrightarrow$ The characterization (2) line 11: in 2005 [9], they established $\longrightarrow$ in 2005 [9]. They established (3) line 16: strongly hopfian (resp. strongly co-hopfian) $\longrightarrow$ strongly hopfian (resp. strongly co-hopfian) (4) line 20: between $\longrightarrow$ is contained (5) line 34 and 36: part $\longrightarrow$ section (6) line 37: EKFN-ring $\longrightarrow$ EKFN-rings	We have changed: "M satisfying" to "M which satisfying", "And let" to "Let" and "Initially identified" to "which used". We have followed your suggestion which was to change the position of: "so $N \subset E$". Then we have rewritten footnote, page 1. We have changed "And then the characterization" to "The characterization", "between" to "is



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(1) the proofs of Proposition 1.1 is canceled. (2) Definitions 1.2, 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6 are described after Proposition 1.1. page 5: (1) to notions of Definition 1.7 are implied in a paragraph not in form theoremstyle. (2) in Definition 1.9, what does mean R_R? (3) are Definition 1.10 and Proposition 1.5 necessary? page 6: (1) to notions of Definition 1.7 are implied in a paragraph not in form theoremstyle. (2) in Definition 1.9, what does mean R_R? (3) are Definition 1.10 and Proposition 1.5 necessary? They are not used any w h e r e . (4) the proofs of Propositions 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 1 and 1.9 are necessary page 7: (1) the proofs of Corollary 1.1, Proposition 1.10 and 1.11 are necessary? page 8: (1) proof of Prop. 2.1, line 2: Let M be an S-module, so ... $\rightarrow$ Let M be an S-module. Then ... 2 SOME REQUIRED CORRECTIONS (2) proof of Prop. 2.1, line 6: and let's $\rightarrow$ We want to show that (3) proof of Prop. 2.2, line 1: Let $K = S^{-1}R$ be the field $\rightarrow$ Let R be a EKFN-ring and let $K = S^{-1}R$ be ... (4) proof of Prop. 2.3, line 2: $R \rightarrow R/P$ $r \mapsto \tilde{r} \rightarrow R \rightarrow R/P$ where $r \mapsto \tilde{r}$ page 9:	contained", "part" to "section", "EKFN-ring" to "EKFN-rings". We have also rewritten in page 3, "line 11" by following your suggestion. We have cancelled: Proposition 1.1, Definitions 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9 and 1.10. Given a ring R, the left R-module R is denoted by R_R. We have cancelled: Proposition 1.5, proofs of Propositions 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9. We think that the proofs of Propositions 1.10 and 1.11 are necessary: the paper will be more understandable. But we have
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(1) proof of Thm. 2.9, line 2: $\forall \rightarrow$ for all (2) proof of Thm. 2.9, line 3: $f: R/P_i \rightarrow R/P_j \quad a + P_i = aP_i \quad \rightarrow aP_j \quad \rightarrow f: R/P_i \rightarrow R/P_j$ where $a + P_i = aP_i \quad \rightarrow aP_j$ (3) proof of Thm. 2.9, line 10: the the set I is finite $\rightarrow$ Now it follows from Corollary 1.1 that I is finite (4) it is better to bring Prop. 2.5 in form of a corollary after Prop. 2.3. page 10: (1) proof of Prop. 2.7, line 8: Hence (1) and (2) imply $\rightarrow$ Hence (1) and (2) of Lemma 2.3 imply (2) proof of Prop. 2.7, line 9: $\forall \rightarrow$ for all (3) proof of Prop. 2.8 is necessary? page 11: (1) proof of Thm. 2.10: the words "proposition" and "theorem" used in context, are written in capital letter	cancelled proofs of corollary 1.1 and Prop 2.1. We have changed "Let $K = S^{-1}R$ be the field" to "Let R be an EKFN-ring. Let K be ...", "$R \rightarrow R/P \quad r \rightarrow r$" to "$R \rightarrow R/P$ where $r \rightarrow r$". In the proof of Thm 2.9, line 2 we have changed "$\forall$" to "for all". We have cancelled "$f: R/P_i \rightarrow R/P_j \quad a + P_i = aP_i \quad \rightarrow aP_j$". We have changed "the the set I is finite" to "Now it follows from Corollary 1.1 that I is finite". Prop 2.5 is in the revised paper, Corollary 2.1. We have changed "Hence (1) and (2) imply" to "Hence (*) and (**) imply". We think that the
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		proof of Proposition 2.8 is necessary: the paper will be more understandable. We have made the words “proposition” and “theorem” in capital letter.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		