

Review Form 1.7

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

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This manuscript is of importance to the scientific community since it's further refining a crucial component i.e. employee retention that has been a centre of focus for many researchers in trying to look for the possible ways of reducing brain drain and turnover menace experienced in many countries.</p> <p>The title is suitable, it is researchable but consider including "IN SELECTED" Private Banks in India as captured in your abstract and your main objective.</p> <p>It is comprehensive though it needs to also capture; target population in terms of numbers, research design used, theories informing the study, sampling technique and sample size, data collection instrument, any pilot study done and where.</p> <p>They are appropriate though I would advise you have the sub sections in paragraphs as oppose to using bullets and numbering</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>References are not sufficient, the entire introduction do not have even a single citation. Consider acknowledging the work of other scholars. In regards to literature review section, use more recent citations, 2018 onwards, a lot has happened on employee retention in the recent past.</p> <p>In the abstract, data analysis should come out clearly i.e. data was analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, standard deviation, mean, ...) and inferential statistics (regression analysis, Chi-square, ANOVA, T-test...).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There seems to be a disconnect between the objectives indicated in the abstract and what is in the CONCLUSION SECTION, conclude based on the specific objectives since that is what you collected data on.</p> <p>Is your study area "private sector banks in India or Ludhiana"? The topic talks of India and the Main objective talks of Ludhiana?</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> Ethical issues are missing the author to consider indicating them.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Judith Chepkemoi
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Economics, The East African University, Kenya