



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.	
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	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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 "acribе"? 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		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Simal Moreira
Department, University & Country	UniFoa – Centro Universitário de Volta Redonda, Brazil