SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJMCS_13330**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Set-theoretic foundations of the modern relational databases: representations of table algebras operations**
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** *(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**I could not tell much originality in the paper, which seems an overview of previous work and results. The text is very brief, there is little discussion and almost no demonstration. It could have been more careful with the wording of certain sentences.** **However, is valid for the didactic aspect.** **I think a second job could detail more goals and techniques of this preliminary work.**	This is the first part of this paper more goals and techniques will be detailed in the second part
Minor REVISION comments	*In line 2 of abstract: The **distinctive**..., and no "distictive". Line 36 –" ... arbitrary finite set ..." there is no need for parentheses in the sentence. Line 41 – " ... is called a finite set of rows ... "there is no need for parentheses in the sentence. Line 47 – " ... a set of all finite subsets of ... "there is no need for parentheses in the sentence. ***Similar recommendation to all other lines in parentheses was used for the same reasons.** Lines 54, 61 and 63 - Change the formatting of X. As it stands, it seems a sign of operation, and not a symbol set. Lines 68, 76 and 83 - The use of the & symbol does not seem appropriate. Best would be to use ^ or "and". Line 78 – " ... introduced the operation ... ".Do not use	All minor mistakes were recovered

	uppercase. Line 95 - Did not understand the expression “every name’s”. Line 115 and others - Would not it be better “full image” or “complete image”? It's just a suggestion. **Line 164 - What does "acribe"? Unknown to such a word.** Line 166 - $\forall R_1, R_2$ Line 203 - Would not it be better to write "scheme of the table t"? Line 220 – “ ... of these **representations** allows...” Lines 219-222 – It is worth (...) set-theoretic constructions. **It would be better to rewrite the sentence. It was very long and confusing.**	
Optional/General comments		