

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126656
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Employee Loyalty and Performance in Taiwan's Semiconductor Industry - Considering the Impact of TSMC's Business Alliance
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 STUDIES CITED IN THE MANUSCRIPT PROVIDE AN IN-DEPTH FOCUS ON TAIWAN'S SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY, DETAILING ITS DEVELOPMENT, KEY DRIVERS, AND GEOPOLITICAL IMPLICATIONS.	Thank you for the reviewer's accurate description of this study.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES. SPECIFIC AND SUITABLE.	Thanks for the reviewer's positive feedback.
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 IS CLEARLY WRITTEN WITH 301 WORDS.	We thank you for the positive feedback.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction</p> <p>- OK</p> <p>- FOCUSED ON THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY</p> <p>- STATED THE RESEARCH GAPS AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY</p> <p>- HOWEVER, LACK OF REFERENCES FROM PAST STUDIES ESPECIALLY IN STATING THE RESEARCH GAPS AND PROBLEM STATEMENTS OF THE STUDY.</p> <p>Literature Review</p> <p>- OVERALL, HAS BEEN DISCUSSED THOROUGHLY AND COVERED ALL THE MAIN VARIABLES FOCUSED ON THE STUDY.</p> <p>- HOWEVER, THE AUTHORS MAY ADD SUBTOPICS DISCUSSING ON EACH OF VARIABLES CHOSEN UNDER INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES</p> <p>independent variables are employee loyalty-related variables, including Employee Seniority, average employee age, Employee Turnover, Employee Growth, and Employee Resign</p> <p>dependent variables are business performance variables, including ROA, ROE, and Profit After tax</p> <p>control variables, such as Asset and Capital rate</p>	Thank you for the reviewer's suggestion. We have added four references, which can be found in the second-to-last paragraph on page 5, the second-to-last and last paragraphs on page 6, and the upper half of page 7. Additionally, we have added the literature discussion at the end of the introduction section on page 4 and at the end of the conclusion section on page 27.

Review Form 3

	<p>Research method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- OK- COMPREHENSIVELY DISCUSS THE DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES.- HOWEVER, IT WILL BE MORE STRUCTURED AND ORGANIZED IF THE AUTHORS COULD POTRAY THE DATA COLLECTION INTO TABLE/FIGURE. <p>Discussion and Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- BRIEFLY REPORTED THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY.- HOWEVER, THE AUTHORS LACK IN DISCUSSING THE FINDINGS TO MORE GOUNDED DISCUSSIONS. THE AUTHORS COULD ADD THE DISCUSSION BY SUPPORTING THE CURRENT FINDINGS WITH THE PREVIOUS FINDINGS AND CRTICALLY DISCUSS THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY TO THEORY, PRACALITY AND SOCIAL.	
<p>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.</p>	<p>THIS MANUSCRIPT IS WRITTEN SCIENTIFICALLY ROBUST AND TECHNICALLY SOUND. THE STUDIES CITED IN THE MANUSCRIPT PROVIDE AN IN-DEPTH FOCUS ON TAIWAN'S SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY, DETAILING ITS DEVELOPMENT, KEY DRIVERS, AND GEOPOLITICAL IMPLICATIONS. THEY ALSO ANALYZE FACTORS LIKE GOVERNMENTAL INFLUENCE, NATIONALISM, AND EXTERNAL DEPENDENCIES, ALL SPECIFICALLY CONTEXTUALIZED WITHIN TAIWAN'S SEMICONDUCTOR SECTOR. THUS, THE FINDINGS ARE INDEED TAILORED TO TAIWAN'S UNIQUE SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY DYNAMICS.</p>	<p>Thanks for the reviewer's positive feedback.</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- CONTAINS 16 REFERENCES FROM PREVIOUS STUDIES.- FOR AN EMPIRICAL STUDY FOR A JOURNAL PUBLICATION, THE AUTHOR MIGHT ADD MORE REFERENCES TO THE INTRODUCTION, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSION SECTIONS.	<p>Thank you for the reviewer's suggestion.</p> <p>We have added the literature discussion at the end of the introduction section on page 4 and the end of the conclusion section on page 27.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WRITTEN IN THIS MANUSCRIPT IS UNDERSTANDABLE AND MEETS THE STANDARDS OF A JOURNAL PUBLICATION.</p>	<p>We thank you for the positive feedback.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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