

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_95756
Title of the Manuscript:	When Love and Hate Collide: The Influence of Conflict on Employees' Turnover Intention
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:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, if thorough corrections can be effected Partly No. The abstract must be reworked to capture the methodology adopted, findings, conclusion and recommendation(s). More modifications required in these areas. Partly Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. The language/English Quality needs thorough editing.	
Optional/General comments	1. The purposes and goals of the research were not clearly stated in the introduction 2. The theoretical background was not appropriately explained and was not based on a broad and critical review of the relevant scholarly literature on the topic 3. The methodology adopted was not precisely and comprehensibly described 4. The study needs to be reworked by considering the reviewer's comments one by one and make corrections appropriately. 5. The article is appropriate for publication after major improvements	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alo Ebenezer Adebisi
Department, University & Country	Adeleke University, Nigeria