SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JESBS_34963**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS TOWARDS THE USE OF HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (LAWSON) IN PAYROLL MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN TANZANIA**
Type of the 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**(i)The researcher must number the various sections of the research whereby Introduction must be 1. and the Literature Review 2. and so on.** **(ii) The heading " Needs and Significance of the Study" should be revised to become " Significance of the Study" that is " Needs and" should be dropped because the significance of the study explains how the study is needed any way.** **(iii) The Methodology is too shallow. The researcher should say more on the quantitative method to be used and on the cross- sectional research design to be used given that readers will be interested to know them.** **(iv) Conclusion and Recommendations must be in capital letters for consistency with other headings. In addition, the researcher must separate the two. Furthermore, the researcher should provide more that the one recommendation provided given that more results have been outlined.**	i) Numbering is NOT accepted when it comes to APA style of academic writings. What is important is coherently flow of titles and sub heads. ii) Significance of the Study was revised and the word needs was dropped. iii) Methodology was improved. It is detailed enough. See the resent paper. iv) Conclusion and Recommendation are now written in capital letter.
Minor REVISION comments	(i). The table should be numbered as table 1, and not table 1.1 which might suggest that the first number is linked to a section.	The numbering of table was revised and written as has been suggested.

Optional/General comments	None	