

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>                                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEBA_125524   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Role of Strategic Human Resources Management in Merger and Acquisition in Access Bank Nigeria I |
| Type of the Article      |   |

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--------------------|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.                        |                    |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  |                    |   |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.   |                    |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  |                    |   |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. |                    |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   |                    |   |

### Review Form 3

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p> |  |  |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract is not well structured. Purpose of the study is missing from the abstract.</li> <li>2. The manuscript mentions the importance of cultural integration following M&amp;As but does not delve deeply into how cultural differences specifically affect employee retention and communication. This critical aspect is not focused on, leaving a gap in understanding the challenges organizations face during integration.</li> <li>3. The author used too many theories in their manuscript, but they still need to clarify the actual relationship between the variables.</li> <li>4. The Author used a questionnaire for data collection; if it is a self-administrative questionnaire, then the author should validate it first.</li> <li>5. The research methodology is weak in terms of utilizing the concept or problem statement. The author should utilize a strong methodology.</li> <li>6. The discussion notes the lack of timely updates during M&amp;As, which could be further elaborated. A deeper examination of the specific communication breakdowns and their impact on employee morale would be beneficial. Exploring how different demographics perceive communication could also provide insight into crafting more tailored strategies.</li> <li>7. The document primarily presents a snapshot of perceptions post-M&amp;A. It lacks a longitudinal perspective that could illustrate how employee sentiments and organizational outcomes evolve following the merger. This would provide a more dynamic view of the long-term effects of M&amp;As.</li> <li>8. While the document presents statistical findings, it could benefit from a more explicit interpretation of these data points. Integrating qualitative insights from the respondents regarding their experiences could offer a richer context and enhance the implications of quantitative data.</li> <li>9. Discussion is needed to relate the results. The results show only these respondents' answer tendencies, but they fail to conclude the study's final verdict. Again, the author suggests using some regression analysis to strengthen the study.</li> <li>10. The critical analysis touches on the resource and knowledge-based view but lacks a robust theoretical framework supporting the research. A clearer linkage between theory and practice could strengthen the conclusions drawn and provide a foundation for future research directions.</li> <li>11. Although the recommendations provided for improving employee retention are relevant, they are somewhat generic. More specific, tailored strategies that consider Access Bank's unique context and workforce dynamics would be more impactful.</li> <li>12. Certain sections of the manuscript may benefit from improved clarity and coherence. Some arguments appear fragmented, making it challenging for the reader to follow the logical flow of ideas throughout the document.</li> <li>13. Reliance on a specific methodology, such as Likert-scale questionnaires administered through an online platform, may introduce bias. Potential limitations associated with this data collection method, including the risk of self-selection bias or respondents' misinterpretation of scale items, are not discussed.</li> <li>14. Citation is not updated in the whole document.</li> <li>15. Decision: Major Revision Required</li> </ol> |  |

#### **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) |
|---|---|---|
| <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> |   |

#### **Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Sobia Jamil                           |
| Department, University & Country | Jinnah University for Women, Pakistan |