

**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>

**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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1, This manuscript is important for scientific community as it looks at and introduces information systems that can help HRM become effective and efficient</p> <p>2. <b>Understanding Employee Acceptance of Human Resource Management Information System: An integrated model of UTAUT and TTF. Evidence from Some Selected Public Firms in Sri Lanka</b></p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, in the findings, author(s) should inform readers the type of analysis run to prove that the factors of Performance Expectation, Task Characteristics, and Technology Characteristics have a positive influence on users' adoption intention to HRMIS. Again, author(s) need to write in full abbreviations and abbreviate in subsequent quotes. For example, SAP should be first written in full</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of this manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. Scientifically the manuscript is correct. It followed the scientific procedures, that is, from abstract to introduction, literature review, methods, findings and discussions, conclusion and implications, and references.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and the majority of the references are recent. However, author(s) should cross-check and make some minor corrections to the in-text citations. Author(s) should ensure that all references in the referencing list are in Harvard Referencing style</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>Author(s) need to improve on the English quality of this manuscript. Proofreading from an internal or external examiner is necessary to enhance the richness of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Author(s) might consider developing the hypothesis under the literature review, instead of the positioning it under the theoretical review. Under the various theories used, author(s) must tell the readers the propounder of the various theories, their premise and antecedents, their applicability to society and the current study.</p> <p>Under the methods, author(s) should clearly include or state the public companies that were utilized and the total number of Executives, Supervisors/Technical Officers, Clerical and Allied employees chosen from each company that constitutes the population of 1100. Again, author(s) should indicate which statistical software was used to run the analysis. Again, a section of ethical considerations should be included in the methods.</p> <p>Under the findings, author(s) should include the factor loadings for all the constructs that enabled the running of the CR and AVE to ensure the validity of the findings. Author(s) should also for clarity sake for readers should provide sections on how each hypothesis was run and present the findings.</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>Samuel Krampah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b>