



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_48676
Title of the Manuscript:	Compensation-Intention to Quit Nexus: A Structural Equation Approach
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	REPORT <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title of the article is very broad and does not give a clear idea on the content of the paper. 2. The paper contains lots of syntactical and grammatical errors. The grammatical mistakes through the texts should also be improved with proofreading. 3. "According to a survey conducted in 2009 on labour turnover...." Do you have current or up to date statistics on that? 4. Reference section and references should be reviewed. There are some references within the text, on the other hand, they are not included in references section (Ivancevich, 2004). At the same time, please list the resources in alphabetical order. 5. "...A survey conducted in institution revealed that, twenty three (23) staff members have left the university between 2008 and 2011..." Is this a big problem when compered to other countries and/or other universities? 6. "...88 percent of the respondents were males and 22 percent were females". When you add them, it makes 110%. 7. The paper is not comprehensive in terms of explaining the methodology. Details on the full process should be explained in detail. I haven't seen the questionnaire. How did you develop the questionnaire? 8. ".....The research hypotheses are tested by assessing..... Where are your hypotheses? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title of the paper has been revised. Page 1 2. We have proof read the paper to take care of the grammatical errors. 3. Data has been updated as suggested. See page 2 4. The references have been revised to reflect the journal's requirement. 5. This is a big problem because, these institutions do not have adequate staff. Besides, there is temporary ban on public sector recruitment. So even if one staff exits, it is a problem. 6. These calculations have been re-done. 7. The methodology section has been revised. See page 10-12. The way the questionnaire was designed is on page 11. 8. The hypotheses are on page 8.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	