



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_25969
Title of the Manuscript:	Fibonacci Numeral Systems and Fibonacci Computers: New Informational and Arithmetical Foundations for Mission-Critical Computer Applications
Type of the Article	Theoretical paper in Mathematics

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	This paper lacks innovation because they do not propose any method in the paper, which is simply the summary of Fibonacci series, without clear justification. The challenging issues such as Fibonacci applications were not well investigated. Finally, the presentation of paper needs to improve. Despite the fact that authors did not do any practical and technical contribution, they have done a theoretical contribution in the field of mathematics by presentation of the Fibonacci series history.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	There are some organizational flow problems as well I believe can be corrected: 1. This research has ambiguous title. 2. This paper needs to propose an experiment using the Fibonacci series. 3. This work is not well experimental results. Only submit the summary of Fibonacci series is quite easy to achieve, whereas experiment with the proposed areas of applications is much more challenging and practical in Computer Science practice and application than a theoretical contribution. Why the author does not consider to experiment with proposed areas of applications? Then add Materials & methods and Results & discussion.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Santiago Tello-Mijares</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Mechatronics Department, Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Lerdo, Mexico</i>