



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_7863
Title of the Manuscript:	On perfect commutative EIFA-ring.
Type of the Article	Research article - Original

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	A ring R is said to be an EIFA-ring if every endo-Artinian R-module is Artinian. Authors characterize the class of perfect commutative EIFA-rings, it is exactly the class of perfect commutative Artinian principal ideal rings. The proof of this characterization uses a previous result of authors and results of Kaidi and Sangharé. The paper is easy to read and proofs are very simple. Here are some remarks that may be helpful to authors: 1. In the title, "ring" should be replaced by "Rings".	Thank you for your remarks. Note that: 1. In the title, "ring" was replaced by "rings". 2. In the abstract, "commutative rings" was replaced by "perfect commutative rings". 3. In the introduction, page 2 all sentences between line 1 "We say..." to line 7 "is Artinian." Were deleted. 4. We have given a more developed definition of a perfect ring (see Definition 2.1 of revised paper). 5. Definitions 1.1 and 1.2 were deleted.
	2. In the abstract, "commutative rings" should be replaced by "perfect commutative rings". 3. The introduction should be focused on the contribution of authors.	6. Proposition 2.1 was deleted. 7. We have done a detailed proof of Theorem 2.2 (See proof of Theorem 3.2 of the revised paper).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. Authors should give a more developed definition of a perfect ring. 5. Definitions 1.1 and 1.2 are not used thereafter. 6. Proposition 2.1 is an immediate consequence of Proposition 1.3[2]. 7. Authors should provide a complete and detailed proof of Theorem 2.2. They used without explanation the fact that F is an M-endomorphism.	
--	---	--