



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>This method is applicable to grading bank branches instead of ranking branches. So in part 3 please change these two concepts.</b>	As I reviewed previous studies, they have used this model to rank the Units. For example, Lea Friedman and Zilla Sinuany-Stern (1997) had used this model for the first time. In their paper, the new method (CCA/DEA) is developed where the Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) is utilized to provide a full rank scaling for all the units rather than a categorical classification (for efficient and inefficient units) as done by the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA).
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Please rewrite your conclusion. The aim of this paper is to introduce a new combined model. But your conclusion was written just about your empirical part (case study).	The conclusion part has been changed, review this part.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	It is better to write briefly some new empirical studies about grading bank's branches. That would be fruitful for the readers to see your model's advantages.  If any ethical issue, clarify	The introduction part had been changed; several new empirical studies had been added.