

Review Form 1.7

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,Hyderabad
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<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>Yes. Good empirical study</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The following points may be verified</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract line Nos. 5&6, "<i>In the IT sector, this great attrition has continued in the IT sector since the year 2020</i>", <i>It sector is repeated.</i> Abstract line No. 21 - <i>It is been observed that among the</i> - It should be "<i>has been</i>" Introduction Line Nos. 24,25,26 - Q4(FY 23-24) - please check and correct the financial year <i>since the Quarter 4 of financial year 23-24 is yet to come.</i> Please check it in three places Table I – In the analysis part only 11 out of 14 factors are interpreted. The remaining 3 factors may also be interpreted irrespective of accepting or rejecting the hypothesis Table 2 – In the analysis part only 11 out of 14 factors are interpreted. The remaining 3 factors may also be interpreted irrespective of accepting or rejecting the hypothesis 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Satisfactory	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In several places Words, sentences are mixed up without proper punctuation and subsequent spacing. This may be checked.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Sundara Ram
Department, University & Country	India