



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>In this paper of “Complete Efficiency ranking by Fuzzy canonical correlation in DEA context”. The authors using Fuzzy canonical correlation in DEA approach to analyze <i>the bank branch efficiency</i>. It is an interesting and important paper.</p> <p>Also, the presentation, style, methodology and interpretation of this paper are appropriate.</p> <p>Several suggestions for this article:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.. The paper has no driving research question.. Without a clear focus at this point the article has little value. It is not clear to explain the contribution of this paper. 2 . Please provide more details the origin of all the data? 3. The results shall compare with the past work .What is the Policy implication? 4. Please more in-depth analysis in concluding. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer