



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9073
Title of the Manuscript:	Complete Efficiency Ranking by Fuzzy Canonical Correlation in DEA Context
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The text must be subject to a careful language revision. As one of the frequent examples of mistakes in writing, see, for instance, the title of Section 3: An application of proposed method to ranking bank branches.	Please accept our apologies; we have tried to eliminate these mistakes.
Minor REVISION comments	There are many applications of DEA in the banks sector. A bibliographical review should be included in the text, at least to provide a basis to the choice of inputs and outputs made.	The introduction part had been changed; several new empirical studies about bank's branches had been added.
Optional/General comments		