



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor typographical errors	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Balavivekanandhan A
Department, University & Country	Department of Media Sciences, Anna University, India