



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_12749
Title of the Manuscript:	ON A WEIGHTED RETRO BANACH FRAMES FOR DISCRETE SIGNAL SPACES
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, corrects the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. In page 3, how to obtain that $\Phi_0^* = 0$? Please give more details. 2. In Example 2.3, what is the role the weights play? Give more details to show that is a Banach space. 3. In page 5, above theorem 2.7, it said that the following theorem gives necessary to admit it's dual. But theorem 2.7 does not give such result. Moreover, during its proof, for the converse part, it is not correct that : "we can find a such that". And how Lemma 1.2 is used to show that is a Banach space? Please give more details. 4. In page 6, please check Theorem 2.9, there are many errors there, such as the two θ should be different and A_d is not used in the proof and one symbol is missing in line -5. 5. In page 7, Theorem 2.10, does that bounded linear invertible operator T exist?	1. In page 3, I agree with reviewer. There is a gap which we correct as $\Phi_0^* \left(\{ \beta_j \} \right) = \begin{cases} \beta_1, & j = 1 \\ \beta_{j+1} - \beta_j, & j > 1, j \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$ Then $\Phi_0^* (\Psi_n) = 0$, for all n. Hence by frame inequality (1.2), we obtain $\Phi_0^* = 0$. This is a contradiction. 2. In Example 2.3. By giving the weight $\omega = \{ \omega_n \} = \{ 2, 1, 1, 1, \dots \}$ We obtain a reconstruction operator $\hat{\Theta}_0 : Z_{d_0} \rightarrow H^*$ such that, $\left(\left\{ \left(\omega_n \Phi_n + (-\Phi_1 + \Phi_{n+1}) \right) \right\}, \hat{\Theta}_0 \right)$ is a weighted retro Banach frame for H^*. By Lemma 1.2 [10, page-189] the sequence space Z_{d_0} is a Banach space with norm given by $\left\ \left\{ \Phi^* \left(\omega_n \Phi_n + (-\Phi_1 + \Phi_{n+1}) \right) \right\} \right\ _{Z_{d_0}} = \left\ \Phi^* \right\ _{H^*}.$ 3. In Page 5, in theorem 2.7, we are strongly agree with you and we give necessary and sufficient condition for weighted retro Banach frame.(not for its dual).



SDI Review Form 1.6

		In proof of converse part of the theorem in line 4, $\ \Phi - \omega_j \Phi_j\ < \delta$ gives $\{\omega_j \Phi_j\}$ is complete in H. Therefore, again by Lemma 1.2, $Z = \{\{\Phi^*(\omega_n \Phi_n)\} : \Phi^* \in H^*\}$ is also a Banach space, as we mentions earlier in answer no.2. 4. We are strongly agreed with you and we also thank you for reading our manuscript carefully. There are some typing errors. We have made the corrections as suggested by you. 5. In page 7, in theorem 2.10, Yes, the bounded linear invertible operator T exists. For this we may refer to example 4 in [11].
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		