

Comments

In the first report, I have suggested the following items.

- (1) In Definition 2.2, if $(Y; *, 1)$ is a BCL^+ -algebra, then $(Y; \leq)$ is a partially ordered set. Of course, this is appeared in [2]. But, did you check it? How do you calculate the transitivity of " $\leq$ " ?
- (2) In Theorem 2.1, (iv) is not a property to prove. It is an axiom which is used in Definition 2.1.
- (3) Theorem 2.1(i) is incorrect since $(1 * (1 * 2)) = 3 \neq 1$ in [2, Table 1].
- (4) Theorem 2.1(ii) is incorrect since $3 * 1 = 3 \neq 1$ in [2, Table 1].
- (5) Line 69: why is this a definition?
- (6) The proof of Theorem 3.3 is incorrect.
- (7) There are so many (grammatical) typos. For example, Suppose that B be subalgebra ... etc.
- (8) In line 68, you said "Note that $x \vee y$ is an upper bound of x and y ." Is it true? How do you calculate it? If this is true, then Lemma 3.4 is surplus.
- (9) Examples of a filtration and a deductive system should be provided.

But the answer is not sufficient to explain the suggestions above. For example, the answer to the first suggestion is incorrect. Generally, the transitivity of " $\leq$ " does not hold in a BCL^+ -algebra. Please refer to the following example.

Example 0.1. Let $X = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}$ be a set with the following Cayley table.

$*$	0	a	b	c	1
0	1	0	0	0	0
a	a	1	1	c	1
b	b	a	1	c	1
c	c	b	c	1	1
1	0	1	1	1	1

Then $(X; *, 1)$ is a BCL^+ -algebra (see [2, Example 2.1]) which does not satisfy the transitivity of " $\leq$ " since $b \leq 1$ and $1 \leq c$, but $b \not\leq c$.

For the other suggestions, the answers are not sufficient and/or incorrect.

Because the contents of revised version are almost incorrect, I cannot recommend this article for publication in your journal.