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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	• In the proof of Theorem 2.5 (c), p.5-6, the inclusion $< f(e) >\leq f^{*}(G)$ 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 ΔΩ ? 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.	
Minor 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 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, tha author states that "Now we can state many equivalent conditions for a function $f : G \to G$ 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.	
Optional/General comments	This is a very interesting article on a quite new and promising topic. It could be published at BJMCS as a communication.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer