



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15218
Title of the Manuscript:	PERMUTATION TEST, NON-PARAMETRIC, AND CONFIDENCE SET APPROACHES TO MULTIGROUP ANALYSIS FOR COMPARING 2 GROUPS USING PARTIAL LEAST SQUARE STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING (PLS-SEM)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I suggest there is need to subject the manuscript to grammar checker software, serious grammatical errors appears in the paper</li> <li>2. A literature review is required to justify the needs for embarking in to the current research also justification is needed for the theoretical frame work that appears in the paper.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grammar has been improved</li> <li>2. The main purpose of this research paper is to present the guideline when to conduct the multi-group analysis conformity of the statistical research and not social science. The factors involved as a research subject to conduct this analysis and thus the readers will make a decision to choose the right approach.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is need to re-visit the citation and references style used in the paper a lot of inconsistencies appears in both the citations and reference in the text.</li> <li>2. Figure(s) 3,4,5 should be in the appendix</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The citation has been improved</li> <li>2. The current Figure 3,4, 5 should be maintained in order to provide better understanding</li> </ol>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	In summary, it is my candid opinion that there is virtually lack of novelty in this paper, the author(s) have only demonstrated their skills in using PLS software.	No agree. To date, this is the first paper demonstrate three approaches simultaneously with the guidelines. The readers now know what the purpose of the particular method but they had difficulty to conduct the analysis.