



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14975
Title of the Manuscript:	Likert Scale: Explored and Explained
Type of the Article	Opinion 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		
Minor REVISION comments	The paper should be carefully edited for English typos and mistakes. Also, some notations are not consistent (e.g., Likert, likert, Liket etc.; item 1, item1, Item-1 etc.)	Sincere thanks for observation. The whole script is revisited for typos correction and to include uniform notation.
Optional/General comments	I have some difficulty in understanding the main goal of this manuscript. Is it "just" a discussion paper, or are the authors willing to point out some current issues and propose some solutions to overcome these? At this point I cannot really figure out the piratical relevance of this manuscript to the journal. Moreover, I think that the abstract lists several important issues but they are either not fully developed (i.e. "Analysis of the response item": how to infer valuable conclusions on the basis of a single artificial example?) or even confusing (I personally don't understand the message of section "Is 7 point Likert scale...", which I also found out somewhat fuzzy). I acknowledge that my expertise area is more in Item response theory and less in the building of (Likert) scales. I have read this manuscript more as a "philosophical" essay rather than a strong scientific (in the IRT sense) paper. So I recommend the authors to better emphasize the novelty and usefulness of this paper in order to meet and convince a broader community of scientists (including me).	We are trying to address the issues raised by esteemed reviewer- this exploratory article attempts to describe two confusing issues related with Likert scale-(would be) preferable numbers of points on a scale and analysis of the scale. During one of the contributing author's participation in a web based conversational learning forum on medical education, these two issues emerged as thrust area amenable for further exploration and lucid explanation for the educational researchers . An initial literature search by authors led to aggregation of mutual conflicting evidences which compelled us to re-explore and further construction of arguments based upon accumulated knowledge. We have also incorporated the following statement in revised script. Thanks again for your valuable comments.