



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>REPORT</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title of the article is very broad and does not give a clear idea on the content of the paper.</li> <li>2. The paper contains lots of syntactical and grammatical errors. The grammatical mistakes through the texts should also be improved with proofreading.</li> <li>3. "According to a survey conducted in 2009 on labour turnover...." Do you have current or up to date statistics on that?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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 compared to other countries and/or other universities?</li> <li>6. "...88 percent of the respondents were males and 22 percent were females". When you add them, it makes 110%.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>8. ".....The research hypotheses are tested by assessing..... Where are your hypotheses?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<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>Atilla Akbaba</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>İzmir Katip Celebi University, Turkey</b>