

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	

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 study is important because it discusses Strategic Human Resource Management and its role in Acquisitions and Mergers. The research area is relevant and useful for new students intending to explore HRM and Financial activities. Moreover, the literature in this area is limited and the current study strengthens the existing literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The body of the article is mainly used to determine the association or relationship, and therefore the title can be changed using one of the words instead of the word "role".	
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 "abstract" needs to be properly rewritten as it does not include any recommendations or conclusions in a specific manner. Moreover, the Abstract includes more keywords rather than being limited to five.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Acceptable	
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 RQ2 and RQ3 need to be realigned to suit the body of the text. The conceptual model has to be redeveloped by identifying the independent variables and the dependent variable. Maybe all three models can be merged and make one model. The indicators used to measure independent and dependent variables should be justified. The conclusions and recommendations need to be strengthened.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language needs to be updated for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The article is acceptable for publication once all the above-mentioned errors are corrected.	

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:	D. L N Senaweera
Department, University & Country	Sri Lanka