

Peer Review

Review of: "Driving Factors for the Adoption of Blockchain: A Focus on Startup Entrepreneurs"

Daniel Arias Aranda¹

1. Universidad de Granada, Spain

This report provides a comprehensive peer review of the paper "Driving Factors for the Adoption of Blockchain: A Focus on Startup Entrepreneurs" by Joshua Ebere Chukwuere from North-West University, South Africa. The paper proposes an integrated conceptual framework for blockchain technology adoption by startup entrepreneurs based on established technology adoption models.

The manuscript presents a narrative literature review (NLR) that examines factors influencing blockchain technology (BT) adoption by startup entrepreneurs. The author proposes a novel Startup Entrepreneur Blockchain Adoption Model (SEBAM) that integrates elements from the TAM, RTAM, UTAUT, and TRI frameworks. The model conceptualizes adoption as a four-stage process: initial, perception, intention, and actual usage. This work contributes to the emerging field of blockchain adoption research, particularly in startup contexts.

Among its main strengths, the paper addresses a significant gap in understanding how startup entrepreneurs can adopt blockchain technology, a growing area of interest with practical implications. In addition, the author successfully combines multiple established adoption frameworks (TAM, RTAM, UTAUT, TRI) to create a comprehensive model specifically tailored for blockchain adoption by startups. The SEBAM provides a logical four-stage process that clearly delineates the progression from initial considerations to actual blockchain usage. Each element of the framework is systematically explained with relevant theoretical backing, creating a thorough understanding of adoption factors. Finally, the paper identifies practical implications for various stakeholders, including developers, policymakers, and academics, enhancing its applied value.

Among its weaknesses, it has some methodological limitations as the narrative literature review methodology lacks the systematic rigor of other approaches like an SLR. While acknowledged by the

author, this limitation is not sufficiently justified. There is a lack of empirical validation, as the proposed SEBAM framework remains conceptual without empirical testing, limiting its practical verification and robustness. In addition, the paper provides limited details on the article selection process for the literature review, reducing methodological transparency.

Regarding hypothesis development, the hypotheses presented for the framework components lack sufficient theoretical grounding and detailed justification, with some components within the framework appearing to overlap conceptually, particularly in the perception stage, without clear differentiation.

Finally, the review of existing adoption models is primarily descriptive rather than critically analytical, missing an opportunity to strengthen the justification for a new integrated framework.

Hence, the paper requires deep modifications and cannot be accepted in its current state.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.