

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_119251</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Retaining Employees in Indian Private Banking Sector</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>It is important. Employee retention is important for any organization in order for the organization to perform and survive in these unprecedented times of swift and turbulent changes especially in the financial space where big data analytics and AI are steadily occupying a very big space in this sector.</p> <p>It is suitable. However, the literature review part deals more with stress levels of employees and the findings deal with factors that employees consider important in the work place. There is a disconnect therefore in the discussions herein. The author should decide on one of these and review the document accordingly.</p> <p>It may need to be reviewed after taking into account the reviewer's comments.</p> <p>They are not, to a great extent. There is no flow between the subsections. You find an abrupt stop of one and a jump into the next. More specifically, the methodology section is missing and without this, the paper is really not complete. Conceptual review, which should give a perspective of what should be under study is also missing.</p> <p>It is correct although sight is lost on what is being studied. A lot of digression was noted in the presentation.</p> <p>They are not sufficient and some are not correctly done. More recent literature (2020 and later) can be reviewed so as to give the current status in the era of AI and generational change which affect the younger generation who are now the workers in most organizations. The author is kind of writing notes from a source indicated instead of reviewing and critiquing available literature. Some parts of the document have no sources/citations as expected in a scholarly article of this nature.</p> <p>Interpretations/Implications of the findings should be given so that it is easily discernible that the objective of the study has been accomplished.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>On average it is, although a few grammatical errors obscure the meanings intended.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>See the tracked comments in the attached reviewed document.</p> <p>In presentation of findings, there should be a reflection of what the study set out to determine. For example, one cannot easily tell which set of findings relate to the financial and nonfinancial incentives for the employees. The hypotheses are incomplete and some are missing. The researcher may wish to label and relate each of the findings to a specific objective.</p> <p>Give a key to explain the various variables/abbreviations. It should not be assumed that everyone knows what they refer to.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Caren Angima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nairobi, Kenya</b>