



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29015
Title of the Manuscript:	The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and its implications to the utilization of mobile learning technologies
Type of the Article	Descriptive

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 see your manuscript is not really a research paper but a review to extol the virtues of TAM and mobile learning. There is a lack of specificity that permeates the entire analysis. The manuscript has little international aspect to it. The manuscript does not go into the conceptual and pedagogic design. The manuscript does not really offer a critical view of its attributes or areas for improvement. The manuscript is just descriptions and reviews. This paper has no real contribution. The discussions of TAM at the beginning do not reflect the most recent reflections about how to rethink mobile technology in the classroom. There is a lack of a strong conceptual framework and methodology in the study. This paper needs more literature to explain and conceptualise the claimed effects	• True, the manuscript is a review article • The author will gain valuable experience and with time will submit more refined articles • I disagree. Literature shows similar articles that authors make attempts to fit technologies to a technology adoption model. Specific cases have been cited on line 131-144 • Subsequent discussions (line 170-244) provides this impression • The author is gaining experience in writing articles for publication • More literature added
Minor REVISION comments	Minor typographical errors	• The typological errors have been corrected
Optional/General comments		• Very useful comments