



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
In my first report, I asked authors to give a complete and detailed proof of Theorem 3.2 (Theorem 2.2 in the first version). In this revised version, the proof of Theorem 3.2 is based on a previous result of authors [Proposition 3.4; BJMCS, 4(3):426-431, 2014]. Reading the proof of this last result, I detected the following error: The authors claimed that “ $m \in M$ is invertible if and only if $m \in rM$”. The proof of the direct implication is correct. For the converse implication, the authors showed that if $m \notin rM$, then m is invertible in C, this fact is not correct; consider $m = rX + 1$, if $m \in rM$, then $1 \in rM$ and 1 is not invertible by the direct implication, a contradiction. Thus $m \notin rM$ and $m \in C$. The characterization Theorem (Theorem 3.4) is called into question because it is based on Theorem 3.2.	You are right. Thank you for your valuable remark. But fortunately, in Theorem 3.2 based on our previous result [Proposition 3.4; BJMCS, 4(3):426-431, 2014], M the total ring of fractions of the ring of polynomials $C[X]$ is a local ring with maximal ideal rM where $(rM)^2 = \{0\}$. Then rM admits a structure of M/rM-vector space of dimension 1 where $\{r\}$ is one base. Thus we can still claim that $m \in M$ is invertible if and only if $m \notin rM$. .