

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_111519</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Understanding Employee Acceptance of Human Resource Management Information System: An integrated model of UTAUT and TTF in a Selected Public Firm in Sri Lanka</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p>6. <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>The article covers the expectations and the formulation of solution proposals is timely.</b> There are many factors that affect the intention to adopt HRMIS in a public company. In some countries, the adoption of these activities via Webb requires greater specialization. However, in these times of globalization, one has to live up to the new realities.</p> <p>2. <b>The title is relevant; however, it is too long for an article.</b> alternative title <b>Employee Acceptance of Human Resource Management Information System: Integrated UTAUT and TTF Model in a Public Company</b></p> <p>3. <b>The summary meets the basic elements; however, the sample size needs to be specified given that it is heterogeneous.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The structure is coherent, as is the treatment of literature.</b></p> <p>5. <b>is correct since it is executed through the proper application of the scientific method</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are adequate and have greater scope</b></p> <p><b>The work is relevant since it promotes virtual platforms, however it could be enriched with AI</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language used is appropriate with some differences in other English-speaking countries</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Working with a multivariate approach provides better alternative solutions to the problem. Well done!</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Luis Florencio Mucha Hospinal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Peruvian University Los Andes, Peru</b>