



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_9521
Title of the Manuscript:	DECOMPOSER TYPE FUNCTIONS ON GROUPS
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- In the proof of Theorem 2.5 (c), p.5-6, the inclusion $\langle f(e) \rangle \leq f^*(G)$ should be fully justified. - In the beginning of §3, the author defines the “standard direct product of Δ and Ω” (considering Δ and Ω to be subsets). In case Δ and Ω are both subgroups, their definition seems identical to the (internal) direct product of subgroups. If they are merely subsets what are the properties of $\Delta\Omega$? In which sense does the definition generalize the subgroup direct product? I believe that it would be very convenient for the reader at that point to include and review these notions in a separate definition.	→ Justified → In case Δ and Ω are both subgroups, the definition become "Zappa-Szép product". For more information, we refer the readers to [8] (as we mentioned at the end of question: "For more properties of factorization of groups by subsets see [8] ")
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In the 3rd line of the abstract, phrase “..then f right [resp. left]...” should be replaced by the phrase “..then f is called a right [resp. left]...” - In the last line of the abstract, the author refers to a paper without specifying which. I guess he refers to [3] of the references, but it should be clearly stated. - In the introduction, in the last lines of the first paragraph, the expression “for a perfect study” should rather be omitted. - Remark 2.2 of p.3 could be replaced by a lemma gathering the discussed results. - In the last paragraph of remark 2.2 (just before example 2.3) there is a typo: “prperty” should be	→ Replaced → Stated → Omitted → It is an obvious result (so we can't state it as a lemma), for more information see [3]. → Replaced



SDI Review Form 1.6

	replaced by “property” • The result after example 2.3 and before lemma 2.4, could also be stated in the form of a lemma (there is also an extra parenthesis in the 8th line of p.4) • In the last line before lemma 2.3 “..an standard..” should be replaced by “..a standard..” • In the last line of the proof of Theorem 2.5 the expression “...proof of the reminded parts are” should be replaced by “...proof of the remaining parts are”. • In the last line of p.7, the author states that “Now we can state many equivalent conditions for a function $f : G \rightarrow G$ to be right weak, ordinary, semi-strong and strong decomposer” but he doesn’t state any of these conditions. Some of these equivalent conditions should be included, otherwise the last proposition should be omitted.	➔ It is a short explanation (not related to the main results). ➔ Replaced ➔ Replaced by another sentence (from a reviewer) ➔ Just a mistake (omitted)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a very interesting article on a quite new and promising topic. It could be published at BJMCS as a communication.	Thanks for your attention