

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126573
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Strategic Human Resources Management in Merger and Acquisition in Access Bank Nigeria II
Type of the Article	Research 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article is very relevant for the main strategic topics related to human resources difficulties in mergers and acquisition scenarios. While the objective to substantiate the linkage between strategic management variables and organizational outcome is important and legitimate the methodology chosen seems only to confirm some obviously true statements.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be more specific, since the article mainly deals with the relationship of three HRM variables that are related to organizational outcomes, rather than to mergers and acquisitions as such. An example might be: The Impact of HRM Factors on Organizational Outcomes – The case of Mergers and Acquisitions in Access Bank Nigeria	
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.	The wording of the abstract is rather confusing. Especially the second and last phrases. A more coherent abstract should follow the classical structure: background, objectives, method, results, conclusions. The abstract refers to a number of 226 participants in a survey, but this is not the value given in section 1.10.13	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, indeed the structure of the article is appropriate in terms of background, conceptual definitions, objectives and methods.	
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.	The paper contains a section meant to describe the contents of each variable that is used later on, but the corresponding sections do not give an operation view on a precise definition used for these variables (especially for communication and outcomes). While The manuscript exhibit both descriptive and inferential statistical tools. There are a few limits in computing indicators of centrality for Likert scale measurements; in order to show the relevance of the items of the questionnaire at least a few examples of questions should be provided, and figure 4 should at least label the items in terms of the contents that are described in the 4 th figure. The noncollinearity tests provided in section 1.11.2 seem to back up the claim on noncollinearity for the analysed variables, while the correlation analysis in 1.11.1 seems to hint otherwise. The author(s) should account for this discrepancy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references and relevant, sufficient and rather recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the wording and language is a bit poor. There are plenty of instances where the predicates are not in the plural when they should be and a few words are misspelled. The article should be thoroughly read again and corrected.	
Optional/General comments	The paper does not give any opinion on the local and sectorial peculiarities of the findings. Are there any specifics of the bank sector in Nigeria that would ask for caution when generalising some of the findings?	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ibrian Caramidaru
Department, University & Country	University of Petrosani, Romania