



Peer Review Report

PEER REVIEW REPORT FOR:

Rodrigues, A. C. (2021). Response surface analysis: A tutorial for examining linear and curvilinear effects. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 25(6), e200293. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021200293.en>

HOW TO CITE THIS PEER REVIEW REPORT:

Rodrigues, A. C., & Souza, P. O. de. (2021). Peer review report for: Response surface analysis: A tutorial for examining linear and curvilinear effects. RAC. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4666473>

REVIEWERS:

-  Pierre Oberson de Souza (Fundação Getulio Vargas, EAESP, Brazil)

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer: Pierre Oberson de Souza
Date review returned: August 28, 2020
Recommendation: Accept

Comments to the authors

The main aspects mentioned in previous revision were revised improving the interpretation of results and providing detailed information to reproduce the example. The only suggestion is to rephrase the sentence in lines 50 to 53 in page 12:

From:

"In Fig. 4, the highest SAT level is at the back of the graph, where the BD and SD are high, and the lowest SAT values at the front of the graph, where the BD and SD are low"

To:

In Fig. 4, the highest SAT level [in the LOC] is at the back of the graph, where the BD and SD are high, and the lowest SAT values [in the LOC] is at the front of the graph, where the BD and SD are low

The way in which the sentence was presented leads to the understanding that the lowest SAT in the entire surface is observed when BD and SD are low, which is not correct. The lowest SAT in the entire surface occurs when BD is high and SD is low.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable): none

Rating:

Interest: 1. Excellent

Quality: 1. Excellent

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 1. Excellent

Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer 2 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Authors' Responses

Dear Dr. Wesley Mendes-da-Silva,

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript RAC-2020-0293 entitled "RESPONSE SURFACE ANALYSIS: AN TUTORIAL FOR EXAMINING LINEAR AND CURVILINEAR EFFECTS". I found the reviewers' comments to be helpful in revising the manuscript and have carefully considered and responded to each suggestion. In the majority of cases I was successful in incorporating the reviewers' feedback into our revised manuscript. I have included a response to reviewers in which we address each comment the reviewers made. I provide a document with all actions taken for each reviewer's comments.

Thank you again for your consideration of our revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

The Author

Comments/Questions/Suggestions	Actions
Associate Editor	
Three paragraphs of your introduction start with RSA, but you only define RSA (i.e., Response surface analysis) in the abstract. I'd suggest describing it in the main text, either	Done
I'd also suggest to state the purpose of your article in the first paragraph, emphasizing this is a tutorial-article about Response Surface Analysis	Done
The abstract is not following RAC guidelines, which demands four sub-parts: Context, Objective, Methods, and Conclusion	Done
Finally, some of your figures are colored; some are not. Can you provide only colored figures?	Done
Reviewer 1	
<p>The main aspects mentioned in previous revision were revised improving the interpretation of results and providing detailed information to reproduce the example. The only suggestion is to rephrase the sentence in lines 50 to 53 in page 12:</p> <p>From: "In Fig. 4, the highest SAT level is at the back of the graph, where the BD and SD are high, and the lowest SAT values at the front of the graph, where the BD and SD are low"</p> <p>To: In Fig. 4, the highest SAT level [in the LOC] is at the back of the graph, where the BD and SD are high, and the lowest SAT values [in the LOC] is at the front of the graph, where the BD and SD are low</p> <p>The way in which the sentence was presented leads to the understanding that the lowest SAT in the entire surface is observed when BD and SD are low, which is not correct. The lowest SAT in the entire surface occurs when BD is high and SD is low.</p>	We rephrased the sentence in lines 50 to 53 in page 12.

[The authors' responses to the comments of Reviewer 2 for this round were omitted from this report, since the reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of his/her report].

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited. Only comments that violate the journal's ethical policies such as derogatory or defamatory comments will be edited (omitted) from the report. In these cases, it will be clearly stated that parts of the report were edited. Check [RAC's policies](#).