



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_19785
Title of the Manuscript:	Undecidability of the criterion for recognizing the Fibonacci numbers
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) The criterion given by (3) should be proved, even it is known. In the latter case, the appropriate references should be given too. 2) The paper seems to be a collection of known results (except the criterion (3)), most of them being obvious. Therefore, in the present form, this work is a review paper, not an original research paper. The mark indicated below is given to this work considered as a review paper. 3) The English of the paper is very good.	The criterion (3) and its consequence (11) is pretty much evident and come out of the basics of the set theory. Nevertheless, I introduced a new sentence making this explanation more obvious. Please observe. Despite all the known facts about the Fibonacci sequence amassed during many decades of studying this sequence and the golden ratio, the undecidability of the criterion for recognizing the Fibonacci numbers is rather novel aspect of this old and very-well known topic (which may seem very surprising, of course). Such a novelty allows classifying this paper as 'an original research' and not a review paper.
Minor REVISION comments	1) The proof of the criterion (3) is required. 2) Line 43: "...an algebraic number..."	Thank you for your comments. Please observe the fixed text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper should be also viewed by a specialist in "Turing – machines" and "undecidability".	I would like to thank the reviewer for the time and consideration. I appreciate all the suggestions and the endorsement given to my manuscript.