Review of: "Adopting the UTAUT model to understand academic use of emerging technologies among Moroccan nursing students"

Sonia Adelé[1]

1 Université Gustave Eiffel

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

There are major problems with the English in this article. It makes it difficult to understand what is said. It is essential to have this article thoroughly corrected by a native speaker to re-evaluate the content once the form has been made comprehensible.

As far as the Background section is concerned, I find that there is too little context on Morocco, Moroccan nurses or the use of new technologies in Morocco or in the Moroccan medical field and in the Moroccan education field.

The literature review is too much a succession of articles and factors that are difficult to articulate as a reader. The author should instead propose an analytical way of presenting existing research in order to bring out the essential ideas. A table of the different factors and studies could also help. The literature review seems rich and recent but it lacks some explanation of the original UTAUT model and its history. I would also like some thoughts on the acceptance of e-learning vs. the acceptance of e-learning tools. I think it's important to separate the two in both the literature review and the discussion. As far as the statistical part is concerned, I'm not in a position to judge the work done as I'm not familiar with this type of model.

The discussion seems very, very short compared to the length of the results section which could call into question the value of the research carried out.

Overall, I find it hard to see what this article adds to all the existing studies, and there seem to be a lot. A section on this should be added at the end of the literature review.

The implications section seems to have little to do with the results obtained and it's hard to see any significant contributions.

To sum up my comments, I would say:

- improve the ability to understand the article,

- better contextualisation,

- better analyse the literature review,

- show what has been added to what already exists,

- deepen the discussion and implications.