



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_11381
Title of the Manuscript:	An absolute deviation approach to assessing correlation
Type of the Article	Method 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	Abstract: "...of underlying assumptions (such as the need for linearity)." Is the author saying that MAD is more tolerant than s.d. for linearity assumptions? (1) LINE 22 – "These twin concerns..." is not entirely clear to me. Can you write this to be more specific? (2) LINE 36 – "...with lack of number." What are you saying exactly? (3) LINE 37 – "What is being taught is currently too often wrong." There should be at least two solid references to support this and a discussion of at least one specific example from these references; it will neatly build-up your framework ☺ (4) LINE 66 – Is this the author's opinion, or a self-evident truth? (I'm not trying to criticize – it is a sincere question.) (5) LINE 99-100 – I am not sure what you mean, exactly. (6) LINE 121 – Very last sentence: ...because...? (7) LINES 139-142: Do you have references for this claim? This is very keen if true and accurate! (8) LINES 144-146 – What you are saying is not entirely clear. (9) LINE 166/167 formula and LINE 182/183 formula – LINE 144 contradiction??? (10) LINE 190-191 – reference this against LINES 170 and 182 – is this what you are referring to? (11) Line 213 – Is the word "vagaries" the best term to use in this context? (12) LINE 239/240 formula and LINE 250/251 formula – LINE 144 contradiction??? (13) LINE 280-281 – This is not clear. (14) LINE 306 – First sentence: Eh?	Yes. And examples given in full paper. All rewritten and clarified.
Minor REVISION comments	(1) LINE 111 – Change "if" with "iff." (2) LINE 203 and LINE 265– There are two typos in each of these figure headings: "twos" and there is no period "." At the end of the title.	No. If is correct. Typos corrected.
Optional/General comments	(1) LINES 53-56 – Very clear! (2) LINE 101-103 – Ditto! ☺ (3) LINE 303-304 – This is interesting! (4) LINE 319-320 – Also well said and interesting!	No changes suggested