



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_18126
Title of the Manuscript:	Fibonacci Numbers and Beyond
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	The authors must include more references (at least ten) and updating references. The Niven's book is very classical to the research; this book is used in the first semester of the mathematician career. Their use in a research to a Journal is unacceptable. Also the Apostol's book, is unacceptable. The methods employed are very simple although are discussed widely with several tools of elemental analysis and polynomial theory. The paper could have certain originality due objectives, but I want that the authors show to me some papers of before work in this respect, since there are other papers with the similar contents. Also books, for example the Courant of calculus. The paper could be published if the authors comply with the improvements and enhance of more research materials and advanced arguments in their intent of generalization to explain a good main result.	Thanks for the comments. The references of Niven's book and Apostol's book represent reliable sources (at least to the authors) to refer the readers to. We respect the reviewer's comment by either adding new sources or by changing the reference. True. The main creative parts are the lemmas leading to the proof of our Theorem 2.1. As we later found out, there were results analogous to our lemmas in recent papers (see especially those who dealt with sum of the reciprocal Fibonacci sequence), but our results complement those recent papers, and may shed some light for how to prove some seemingly open problems such as the sum of higher power reciprocal Fibonacci or general recurrence sequences. These problems attract us and some other researchers, as can be seen by searching the very recent preprints. This is part of our future work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		