



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10887
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Weyl approach to tensor representations of exceptional Lie groups: The case of G_2 and F_4
Type of the 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	I do not think revisions are necessary although I would conclude that the manuscript has low readability, which makes comprehension somewhat difficult and as such the readership of this article will only be for very technical people.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article has very good overview of the Lie group. I believe the comparable study done in section 7 was very useful. It was demonstrated that their methodology works on G_2 but it was not clear if the author is suggesting that their methodology failed to yield information about how to understand F_4 . If so, what is the reason for this to occur? The author suggests that they would need to do a more generalization of procedure, which was never clearly defined. It is not clear whether they were referring to the Weyl procedure or not.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Horace Crogman
Department, University & Country	Institute for Effective Thinking, USA