

Review of: "Adoption of Technology Acceptance and Interfaces for Academic Information System Applications"

Krayyem Al-Hajaya¹

¹ Mutah University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this article. The article addresses a significant issue concerning the acceptance of new technology information systems in the era of Industry 4.0 evolution for digital transformation. However, the study suffers from several limitations as follows:

Firstly, the study lacks an academic writing style in terms of synthesis, smooth flow of writing, clarity, and errors, which limits the understandability of many debates in the article. The article needs to be rewritten. While the implications of the study on academic institutions are fairly presented, the novelty of the paper and its contribution to theory need to be articulated to inform readers that the study is original and adds to the wider academic debate in this context.

The study utilizes the TAM model, which is perfect for measuring the adoption of new technology by individuals. However, the study pairs the User Interface with TAM pillars, namely PU and PEOU. I am just wondering whether the User Interface is a theory of adoption of new technology or whether it is a part of the technology itself. My knowledge in this area tells me nothing regarding the User Interface as a theory for technology diffusion and adoption.

While the paper briefly discusses TAM model dimensions to develop hypotheses, it remains silent regarding the literature review. I suggest revisiting this section to improve it and introduce a section for a literature review.

Background data for the major and institution in which the study was conducted is needed.

Some demographics on students who participated in the study are required, including the year of the study, gender, and other relevant information.

Regarding the analysis, I think the study employed partial least squares regression, not a t-test as stated. This needs to be corrected.

The conclusion is very light and needs to be revisited to provide an insightful conclusion that reflects the outcomes of the research, contribution to theory, implications for practice, limitations, and directions for future research.

All the best,

Krayyem

