



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	

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	* It would have been better if the manuscript did a meta-analytic review of studies proposing, criticizing, using or are basing on Technology Acceptance Model. You may do so by providing a matrix of the contentions of the authors uncovered in your meta-analytic review. * While meta-analysis might be an additional burden for this paper, it is merely a suggestion. The more important thing here is to provide a logical sequence of the review of literature that you provided in this paper. I cannot see any short description of method that you use in your documentary analysis.	• The intention of the review article was not to criticize TAM, but to examine how scholars have attempted to fit m-learning to TAM.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	* Provide authors of studies contending your point in Lines 27-29. * Space before open parenthesis of authors. Check Lines 38 and 39. Check also Lines 75, 76, 81, 127, 128, 144. * Rephrase the sentence(s) that are directly quoted, as seen in Lines 118-121. * Check spelling in Lines 23, 64, 73, 95.	• Provided • Corrected • Corrected • Corrected • Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	* Please check spellings, spaces and directly-quoted statements. Have the paper checked by an English expert.	• Corrected