



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 <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>
	The paper titled "On commutative EKFN-rings with ascending chain conditions on annihilators" is a collection of well known and trivial results with some nonsenses. I do not recommend it for publication.	
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I have indicated some corrections on the manuscript that are listed below. 1) Abstract, line 5. Change "well known" to "clear". Endo-noetherian modules are not "well known". 2) Introduction, line 2. "initially identified" is not correct. Before Noether the acc is studied by Dedeking in 1894 and by Lasker in 1905. 3) Page 2, line 1. It is a triviality that the acc on ideals is equivalent to the non-existence of an infinite strictly increasing sequence of ideals. Noether showed that a commutative ring satisfies the acc on ideals if and only if every ideal is finitely generated. 4) The finiteness of the dimension of a vector space is equivalent to the noetherian or artinian condition 5) Yours "Definition 1.1" is not a definition. Start with "Given R..." and continue with It is a well known result that $\text{End}(R_R) = \dots$ (Delete Prop 1.1 [1] P.203 and the proof)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6) Definitions 1.4 and 1.5 are not correct. 7) Page 4 last line. R is a left artinian ring. 8) Theorem 1.3 is a well known result for a commutative ring that are in every book on commutative algebra but it is not in your reference [8] moreover Page 68 does not exist in [8]. 9) Your Definition 1.7 is not a definition, you can use “Remark” but it is also a well known result. 10) Proposition 1.4 is also a well known result in [6] the authors cite the book of Kasch, Modules and rings. Delete your proof. 11) It is trivial that every Noetherian module is endo-noetherian. Delete Prop 1.6 and your proof. 12) Prop 1.7. It is also well known that Z-endomorphisms of Q are zero or automorphism. Delete your proof. 13) The proof of Prop 1.8 is trivial. Delete the proof. 14) Definition 2.1. The name EKFN rings is not clear. What does it means?. 15) The proof of Prop 2.1 is trivial. Delete the proof. 16) The field of fractions of an integral domain it is well known then it is superfluous to write “$K=S^{-1}R$” where $S=R-\{0\}$” 17) In the proof of Prop. 2.4, f is not well defined.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	NO	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NO	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer