



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_13973
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF SOME CONVOLUTION SUMS AND REPRESENTATION NUMBERS OF QUADRATIC FORMS OF DISCRIMINANT -135.
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	1. Section 2 is completely missing (hopefully this does not cover math content). 2. There is not enough elaboration on how you reach your results: a brief summary of the key facts or theory would greatly help the readability of the paper. For example, it is recommended that a thorough explanation is made for at least one of your typical formulas. 3. To get the results for $W(n)$ (for various indices), one does require the theory of quasi-modular forms, but in the paper only the bases of modular forms are mentioned. Is it the case that you used only modular forms for computing $r(n)$ (for various indices)? It appears from your writing that you do not really need quasi-modular forms for computing the $r(n)$. If this is the case, it would greatly help that you explain how you get $r(n)$ based on some of $W(n)$ (if necessary). Of course the method may appear in the papers you cited, but it is always good to briefly explain so that the readers do not need to search around the references to see exactly which method you have used. 4. The other serious issue is that in most of your formulas for $r(n)$ (for various indices) there is the appearance of undefined constants such as a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, etc. This made your formulas useless, and impossible to check.	1- I t has been corrected. 2- I have briefly described my method at page 4, highlighted in yellow colour. 3- You are right that I don't need the quasiforms for section 3. I have used only modular forms here. But for quadratic forms of the form $Q+tP, t>1, t 135$, the representation numbers can be only obtained by convolution products and I briefly explained in section 4. 4- I have changed for greek letters and defined exactly in notations.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Computer program is not required, but algorithm for your computation may be explained (even briefly), and certainly this would do the community a service. 2. The page number does not show up except for the first page. 3. Here are some obvious typos: On page 2, two appearances of $W_{135}(n)W_{3,45}(n)$ should be separated by a comma. On page 9, in $F_2 = F+F+F+F$ (direct sum), the F_2 should be replaced by F_4. 4. All notations should be clearly defined. If you follow other papers' notations, explicitly state so.	5- I have briefly described my method at page 4, highlighted in yellow colour. 6- I t has been corrected. 7- They have been corrected. 8- I have added notations in section 1
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The Latex compilation should run twice in order that all references show up correctly (i.e. without question marks as in your manuscript). 2. Lengthy computer outputs may be put in the appendix, but of course this is optional.	1-OK.