



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	• This paper needs a clear cut objective, a thorough framework, and a clearly stated research methods. Also the findings and implications are not clearly stated. • In line 85: I am totally confused about your Figure1. What is it telling? Is it your research framework? As you mentioned you have adopted it from Venkatesh et.al (2003), to my knowledge their paper does not have a figure like this. You did not mention the title of the Figure? What is it for? Did you use this model for your paper? This is not clear from your write-up. If you plan to use this model, remember it is not a model, that someone come up with so far. If you propose this model, you should provide proper literature review for this model and ensure the reliability of your model. • Lines 93-107: You have provided only one reference which was 4 years old to support your claims about TAM's applicability. Several other TAM studies were published recently after 2012. You should use more recent references to support your claim about internal and external factors. • Lines 108-121: The Heading 'Industrial Application of TAM' is misleading. All you talked in this part is about TAM's application in research so far. • Line 123-212: You have explained the TAM model (developed by Davis, 1989), you need to add a Figure of this model so that readers know which you are talking about. • I don't find any clear-cut findings of your research.	• The paper was a review article research method may not be applicable • Model revised. I have included the model as proposed by Davis 1989. • Figure is mentioned on line 95 • The model informs the discussions from line 164-222 • Reviewed. More authorities have been quoted on Line 123-144 • The Heading has been reviewed accordingly • Figure has been included on 99-105



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Be more specific about your research objective and tie it up with your findings. • Needs thorough proof-read as the paper has major issues with many grammatical errors • Please clarify the issue: Figure 1, the citation they provided for the figure does not match. Venkatesh et.al (2003) never presented a Figure like this.	• The conclusion gives the contributions arising from the review • Proof reading has been improved • Figure replaced with the TAM Davis (1989) model
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Needs thorough proof-read as the paper has major issues with many grammatical errors	The remarks were useful