



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This method is applicable to grading bank branches instead of ranking branches. So in part 3 please change these two concepts.	
<u>Minor</u> 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).	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ehsan Rasoulinezhad
Department, University & Country	Saint Petersburg State University, Russia