

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

Elodie Jouny-Rivier

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the article titled "Adoption of Technology Acceptance and Interfaces for Academic Information System Applications".

While the paper presents intriguing developments, there are several areas that could be enhanced.

Firstly, the title could be improved. The correct term is 'Technology Acceptance Model', and it may not be accurate to say "adoption of technology acceptance."

The article is easy to comprehend and read.

However, it lacks examples in the introduction section. The authors do not sufficiently highlight the benefits of such a system for all stakeholders. A table with sources could be included for clarity. The research gap is not adequately emphasized, and the structure of the article is not outlined at the end of this section.

Please consider using "Literature Review" instead of "The Art of Research."

The development of the two hypotheses, H1 and H2, on Perceived Ease of Use (PEAU) and Perceived Usefulness (PU), is quite basic. The explanations of the hypotheses could be enhanced. I was unable to find any conceptual model representing the concepts and hypotheses. In addition, a conceptual model representing the validated concepts and the measures could also be included at the end of the results part.

In the research method section, it would be beneficial to provide information on why studying this question in Malang city is of interest. What are the specific characteristics of this population/country? What systems are already in place? In the data collection process, the rationale for sharing both online and offline links is not clear. The section also lacks information on the sample, such as demographic information. More details on the scales, items, and sources could be provided.

The results are somewhat difficult to interpret, particularly with the integration of Table 1. This could be redesigned for better readability.

The discussion section requires the most improvement. There is no clear distinction between the theoretical and managerial implications. The results are not incorporated into this section. What are the novel findings? What are your contributions? How can managers benefit from this? What are the societal implications? Additionally, there are no

limitations and future research directions discussed. The conclusion is also quite brief and does not provide substantial information.

Best of luck with your paper!