

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_108076
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study On Employee Retention Strategies At Select IT Companies in Hyderabad
Type of the Article	Original research

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The problem, however, is that the paper is not proofread or edited. Therefore, it is poor because the meaning of the content is loss among the many errors in the text... Need a serious review first [Sample corrections is attached to be shared with you]</p> <p>Read the author's guidelines for the paper... remove all footnotes and move to the end of the paper</p> <p>The abstract is somehow adequate. It mentions the objective of this study, then the methodology [but does not state the approach followed] does not mention sampling and sample size. It shows the results and ends with implications. Needs proofreading [see suggestions]</p> <p>Keywords are adequate</p> <p>The introduction is poor and needs to be validated with reported research or references to validate the concepts. Overall, this section is to be rewritten as indicated and corrected [attached Manuscript] to build on the next parts of the research with clarity of purpose.</p> <p>The methodology needs review for clarity and details.</p> <p>The results are clear, with adequate data tables. Good to support the discussion.</p> <p>The discussion is not reviewed due to the many errors in the text....</p> <p>The conclusion is not reviewed as well</p> <p>Limitations are not reported??? Must add</p> <p>Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, and completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements.</p> <p>Proofreading is seriously needed [see suggestions]</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon