



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 paper deals with limiting ratios of recurrence sequences. Authors claim to provide a new result about. However, their main theorem is a very well-known result that can be proved in a very simple way (simpler than the proof provided in this paper, see the attached file). Moreover, the result claimed in Theorem 2.1 is neither completely precise nor general. Indeed, it is well-known that limiting ratio of recurrence sequence there exists when the characteristic polynomial has a real root largest in modulus than the others (see the attached file)	The theory of linear recurrence sequences has a long history and therefore there are many well-known results. Of course, one can apply the known result to deal with the problem we are working on, an approach we did not follow. Instead we worked out all details using elementary methods that we figured out ourselves but they may be known to the expert. We acknowledge your effort for typing up a short proof of yours, which claimed to generalize the result in our Theorem 2.1, but you may have missed the important point that we did not make the assumption on a root having the maximum modulus (for if we did, everything would follow trivially just like your note). We need to bring to your attention that in your proof you have not considered the case when the polynomial might have repeated roots (though of course this can be easily resolved). Furthermore the initial conditions have to satisfy proper condition for your assertion to be true (see the remarks we added in section 2): for example, your proof breaks down if $A_1=0$. We apologize for not making our statement more precise so as to cause your misunderstanding. We have tried to make our statement more precise, and added some remarks.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		