



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	The manuscript addresses an interesting topic that suggests new correlation measures. However, it has serious methodological issues that must be considered. Basically, it seems that the author totally misunderstands the Pearson's correlation coefficient. For example, In Line 174 of Page 4, the author claims that "..., it can be cancelled in a way that is not possible for the coefficient based on standard deviations." This statement is incorrect! In fact, in Pearson's R, the number of samples will be cancelled since the numerator has $1/n$ and the denominator has two $\sqrt{1/n}$. In addition, the expression in Line 180 of Page 4 is wrong. If we look at the expression in Line 168 of Page 4, the numerator has $1/n$ and the denominator has two $1/n$. Therefore, the expression in Line 180 must have $1/n$ in its denominator. Another concern is about Figure 1. Let's assume that the author used the expression in Line 180 of Page 4 for RA1. In this case, from my simple calculation, Pearson's R must always be greater than or equal to RA1 because $\sqrt{a^2+b^2} \leq a + b$. However, Figure 1 shows that RA1 is greater than or equal to R. Further, the author's interpretation in Line 206 of Page 5, "A standard deviation is ... the figures by squaring," makes me doubt whether the author has a clear idea for Pearson's R. Because the author must compare between the square root of sum of square and the absolute deviation. For these reasons, I stopped reviewing the manuscript further from Line 207 of Page 5. The author must verify all the works thoroughly including the mathematical expression and the simulations (especially, Figure 1).	
Minor REVISION comments	It is hard to catch the author's point at the paragraph in Lines 134-148 of Page 3. Please restate the paragraph.	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer