



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_20464
Title of the Manuscript:	Weak implication on monadic Heyting algebra
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper has been able to provide some valuable insight into the monadic Heyting algebras. But the paper is not very carefully written and there are quite a few minor mistakes. Some are listed below: 1. Page 100, in "title", "algebra" should be "algebras". 2. In "Preliminaries", the information provided is incomplete. During the past two decades the Heyting algebras has been booming in related study published. For example, Bezhanishvili, G., Varieties of monadic Heyting algebras. Part I, <i>Studia Logica</i>, 61 (1998), 367-402. ----- Part II: Duality theory, <i>Studia Logica</i>, 62 (1999), 21-48. ----- Part III, <i>Studia Logica</i>, 64 (2000), 215-256. Bezhanishvili, G., and Harding, J., Functional monadic Heyting algebras. <i>Algebra Univers.</i> 48 (2002), 1-10. Abad, M. and D'iazvarela, J. P., Free algebras in the variety of three-valued closure algebras, <i>J. Austral. Math. Soc.</i> 72 (2002), 181-197. Rueda, L., The subvariety of Q-Heyting algebras generated by chains, <i>Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina</i>, 50 (2009), 47-59. 3. Page 105, in "References" plug in the era to the first and third.	I am grateful to anonymous referee for close reading about our paper. We could improve it. We parcial agree with Abad and Ruedas 's papers have a direct relation with our manuscript. However if the referee insist on put it we will put it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. Page 102-103, Lemma 3.1, its proof: “$\nabla((\Delta x \rightarrow \Delta y) \wedge \Delta x) \leq \Delta y$”, “$\Delta(\Delta x \wedge y) \leq \Delta y$”. This result should explain “why” it further, it seems better to add some steps on less than or equal to Δy. 5. In Lemma 3.2, its proof: “by (I1) we conclude the proof”. Was this “by (I1)” ? Why is that? 6. Page 103-105, E2, E12, D2, H10 should be (E2), (E12), (D2), (H10)..... Add BRACKETS. 7. In Lemma 3.4, its proof, (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii): By (I1), we have $((\Delta x \rightarrow \Delta y) \rightarrow \Delta x) \rightarrow x = \Delta x \rightarrow x = x \Rightarrow x=1.$ 8. Page 105, in Theorem 3.5, its proof: “Monteiro (1971) and wellknown results on Tarski and Boolean algebras.” While this is certainly useful, often we need to know the mysterious narration comes from “References” (the sources are indicated in the paper), and it would be more useful to the readers, everything else is an act. In summary, although there is still some room for improving the manuscript. But my opinion is that the paper to be accepted for publication in the journal.	
--	---	--