

Report on the first revision of the manuscript “Decomposer type functions on groups”

Manuscript number: 2014-BJMCS-9521

Reviewer’s decision

The revised version of the paper has tried to address all the issues, which had been mentioned in the previous report of the referee. The author has certainly done a good job, but still failed to provide a publishable output. More precisely, there are still quite a lot of misprints (especially in the added section “Conclusion”), as well as a couple of mathematical issues to deal with.

In view of the above discussion, it is our opinion that the manuscript needs a minor revision before it could be accepted for publication in “BRITISH JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS & COMPUTER SCIENCE”. To facilitate the adjustment process, the author is advised to consult the two subsequent sections (which are called “Misprints” and “Mathematical issues”, respectively), which contain recommendations of the referee on the possible improvements of the manuscript.

Misprints

Below is the list of misprints found in the paper as well as possible language style improvements. The author is strongly advised to check carefully the English language of the manuscript before submitting its revised version.

1. Page 1, line 3 of Abstract: “group and,” should be “group, and” (please, mind the comma).
2. Page 1, lines 5 - 6 of Abstract: “called decomposer” should be changed to “called *a* decomposer”. The pattern “*f* is *a* [some type of] decomposer” (and also “*f* is *a* [some type of] separator”), i.e., using the indefinite article “a”, is to follow carefully throughout the paper.
3. Page 1, line 12 of Abstract: “In the way, we” should be “We also”.
4. Page 1, line 2 of “*Key words and phrases*” in the footer: “group .” should be “group.” (the space is redundant).
5. Page 2, line 4 up from Section 2: “*and*” should be “and” (no italic).

6. Page 2, lines 1, 3 from below: the periods of the end of the lines in question should be semicolons. Similar remark, for page 3, lines 2, 4, 5.
7. Page 3, line 5 up from Example 2.3: a comma before “but” is missing. Similar remark, for page 7, line 7; page 7, line 3 up from Section 3.
8. Page 3, line 3 up from Example 2.3: “ $f * (G)$ ” should be “ $f_*(G)$ ”.
9. Page 4, line 1 (the definition of “ $f(x)$ ”): a period is missing after “ $x \notin \Omega$ ”. The next line should run as “It can be seen that f as a (standard)”.
10. Page 5, line 1: “ c^{-1} then” should be “ $c^{-1},$ ” (please, mind the comma).
11. Page 5, line 5: a comma is missing after “Conversely”.
12. Page 5, line 3 up from Theorem 2.5: a period is missing after “ $c < 0$ ”.
13. Page 6, line 3: “this means” should be “this means that”.
14. Page 6, line 10: “ $f(e)$ thus” should be “ $f(e)$. Thus”, and a period is missing at the end of the next line.
15. Page 6, line 11 from below: “ e thus” should be “ e . Thus”.
16. Page 6, line 7 from below: “employing” should be “employing the above properties of $*$ -conjugations”.
17. Page 6, line 6 from below: “followings” should be “following”.
18. Page 7, line 9: “e.g.” should be “e.g.” (a period instead of the comma).
19. Page 8, line 5: “ $bd|0$ ” should be “ $bd|0$ ” (the spaces are missing).
20. Page 8, line 5 from below: “ $\lambda \in \Lambda$, thus” should be “ $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Thus”. On the next line, a comma before “so” is missing.
21. Page 8, line 2 up from below: “ $P_\Omega(x)$ so,” should be “ $P_\Omega(x)$, so” (please, mind the comma).
22. Page 9, line 1 of Section 4: “A main result of the study is” should be “The main result of this paper states”. On the next line, “is all right” should be “is provided by all right”.
23. Page 9, line 5 of Section 4: “to a direct” should be “to direct”, and “ $\Omega \cdot \Lambda$ (respectively)” should be “ $\Omega \cdot \Lambda$, respectively”.
24. Page 9, line 6 of Section 4: “open” is redundant. Moreover, on the next line, “reminded” should be “open”.
25. Page 9, line 8 of Section 4: “**Unsolved problem**” should be changed to “**Open problem**”. On the next line, “function and” should be “function, and let” (please, mind the comma), and “Does $\Delta = \Omega?$ ” should be “Is it true then that $\Delta = \Omega?$ ”.

26. Page 9, line 13 of Section 4: “emphasis that the” should be “emphasize that our”, and “is usable for” should be “can be used for the investigation of”. On the next line, “studying” is redundant.
27. Page 9, line 2 up from “Acknowledgement”: “sub-class” should be changed to “subclass”, and “subset-projections” should be “subset projections” (no dash).
28. Page 9, lines 1 - 2 up from “Acknowledgement”: the expression “(as an application ... such equations)” is redundant.

Mathematical issues

Below are the mathematical issues, which raise the concern of the referee, and which, therefore, should be addressed by the author in the revision of the paper.

1. Page 7, line 8 of Section 3: the notation “ $\Delta.\Omega$ ” is not explained by the author.
2. Page 9, line 3 up from “Acknowledgement”: for convenience of the reader, the author should be more particular on “the question before Lemma 2.4” he has in mind (and which was not found by the referee).