

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_117306
Title of the Manuscript:	ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ITS EFFECTS ON EMPLOYEE RETENTION IN BANANA COMPANIES: A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Quantitative

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, there are some amendments need to do mentioned in the above and manuscript.</p> <p>No, need to be amend as "IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON EMPLOYEE RETENTION: SPECIAL REFERENCE TO BANANA COMPANIES"</p> <p>No, need to be further improve.</p> <p>Yes, a few amendments need to do</p> <p>Patricianly correct</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract - The first part of the abstract tries to show the research gap of the study. However, it is a common research gap. You have to give a sound research gap with the research phenomena to the study sample. 2. Background of the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd page – 3rd paragraph "Although prior research on employee retention had been conducted (Madurani & Pasaribu, 2022), none of these studies had focused on how organizational justice affects employee retention in banana companies' offices" The highlighted phrase needs to be amended – you should have to mention it as "There are few research had focused...". Because you cannot mention 'None of the studies", it means any researchers do not address the particular problem as a research gap. Then, how do you do research without having a previous research area on that? Therefore, you need to be thoroughly concerned about the usage of those types of wordings. • 4th page – 2nd paragraph "The results of this study wouldworkforce management practices". – no need to mention it. Because you can clearly state this in the abstract and conclusion sections. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is better to separately mention the purpose of the study. • Further, it is better to add general, specific objectives, and research problems of the study. 3. Problem statement should be further improved. You need to specifically mention contextual, knowledge etc. gaps related to the <u>prior studies.</u> 4. Literature review – need to be added with citations 5. Hypotheses – change the topic to 'Development of Hypotheses' You need to give previous literature evidence on your developed hypotheses and 	<p>Dear Reviewer,</p> <p>Thank you for providing detailed feedback on the manuscript. We appreciate your thorough review and insightful suggestions for improvement. We have carefully considered each of your points and will address them accordingly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. **Abstract Research Gap**: Thank you for highlighting the need to articulate a more specific research gap aligned with the study sample. We will revise the abstract to provide a clearer delineation of the unique research gap addressed by our study within the context of banana companies' offices. 2. **Background of the Study**: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We acknowledge your point regarding the need for precision in stating previous research focus. We will amend the phrase as suggested to accurately reflect the existing research landscape. - Your suggestion to omit mentioning the implications of the study in this section is duly noted. We will streamline the content and reserve such discussions for the abstract and conclusion sections. - We will enhance the clarity of the study's purpose by explicitly stating general and specific objectives,

Review Form 1.7

	<p>then mention your hypotheses. Moreover, in this section, you need to state it in the 'Future/Present tense'. Because there is a valid flow in the journal articles. After you complete your analysis section then only you can discuss the result that you have obtained and mention 'What sort of relationship did you find?'. Hence, the hypothesis should be amended as 'There is a significant relationship between organizational justice and employee retention in banana companies' offices in Santo Tomas, Davao del Norte.</p> <p>6. Conceptual framework – needs to be amended (Suggestion given in manuscript)</p> <p>7. Significance of the study – need to be mentioned in one paragraph. No need to separately mention each party.</p> <p>8. Conclusion – add more citation based on literature review.</p> <p>9. Topic should be change</p> <p>Highly appreciate the researchers' efforts and recommend doing more studies in future. Especially, researcher can follow Emerald Insight, Academia, Willey etc. quality articles.</p>	<p>as well as research problems.</p> <p>3. **Problem Statement**: We recognize the importance of refining the problem statement to specifically address contextual and knowledge gaps related to prior studies. We will provide a more targeted and precise problem statement in alignment with this feedback.</p> <p>4. **Literature Review**: Citations will be added to strengthen the literature review section, providing robust evidence to support the study's theoretical framework and hypotheses.</p> <p>5. **Hypotheses Development**: We will rename the section to "Development of Hypotheses" and ensure that each hypothesis is supported by relevant literature evidence. Additionally, we will present the hypotheses in the future/present tense, consistent with the standard flow of journal articles.</p> <p>6. **Conceptual Framework**: We will review and amend the conceptual framework based on the suggestions provided in the manuscript.</p> <p>7. **Significance of the Study**: Your recommendation to consolidate the significance of the study into one paragraph is noted. We will revise this section accordingly for better coherence and clarity.</p> <p>8. **Conclusion**: We will enrich the conclusion section by incorporating additional citations from the literature review to underscore the significance and implications of our findings.</p> <p>9. **Title Modification**: We will consider changing the title to better reflect the refined focus and scope of the manuscript.</p> <p>We deeply appreciate your acknowledgment of the researchers' efforts and your recommendation for future studies. Following your suggestions, we will strive to align our work with the quality standards set by reputable journals and publishing platforms.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for your constructive feedback. We are committed to addressing the outlined suggestions to enhance the quality and relevance of our manuscript.</p>
--	---	---

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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