



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	<p>The manuscript is basically a direct application of a fuzzy DEA implementation using alpha-cuts and a fuzzy canonical analysis on an unspecified data set from 'Iranian banks'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is misleading, there is nothing particular about completeness; no generality about DEA. It could be "An application on fuzzy canonical correlation and DEA to Iranian banks" 2. The introduction p.1 -2 is much too long and elementary, a reader interested in the topic would be familiar with all the standard motivations that could be deleted. 3. The review concerning certain issues, such as superefficiency is inadequate; after Anderson and Peterson (1993), they cite an obscure reference (auto-citation?), but omit to mention that these problems were already well explored and resolved in Bogetoft (1994) and later, cf. a bibliography in DEA 4. Fuzzy DEA has a long tradition, replace the odd citation with a survey, e.g. Hatami-Marbini, A., Emrouznejad, A., & Tavana, M. (2011a). 5. The paper is edited in a very poor English; no definite articles, errors in singular/plural, syntax, order of words etc. Before any resubmission to any journal, the manuscript should be proofread by an English-speaking person. 6. Given that there is nothing new in the model, the focus should be on the application: where exactly is the data coming from , which banks, cross-section or time-series, relation with the bank/management? why would fuzzy canonical analysis be particularly useful here? why is all the production set considered as fuzzy? the analysis does not involve a single economic dimension (costs,revenues, rates) – why ? 7. the documentation for the various alpha-cuts is superfluous and does not add value 8. no analysis or comment whatsoever is made on the results? here, the paper must show something beyond the numeric results to convince a reader that their implementation is of relevance for an academic or managerial audience. in the current editing, the manuscript merely shows feasibility, i.e. one could calculate 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(something) using this approach. 9. Naturally, the conclusion should summarize the analysis (non-existing) with respect to earlier work in bank evaluation (non-existing) and state the contributions.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper could be cut to 5 pages if proper reference was given to earlier results and the editing focused at the implementation.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer