

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

Evandro Lopes¹

¹ Universidade Federal de São Paulo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study entitled "Adoption of Technology Acceptance and Interfaces for Academic Information System Applications" addresses a relevant and interesting issue. Although studies conducted using the methodology proposed by Frank Davis (TAM Model) are not new, the application in the context defined by the authors is interesting.

The paper is well-written and addresses recent theoretical references. I think that the version submitted is at an advanced stage for definitive publication.

I have a few recommendations for the authors to make the text even more relevant.

1- As the literature indicates, the normality test used is quite fragile because it is conducted by visual analysis of a graph. It is strange that the authors have chosen this method, as data analysis software already incorporates more robust tests such as Shapiro's W and/or Z Kolmogorov-Smirnov. I recommend using the latter to analyze normality. I recommend using the latter to analyze the distribution of the data analyzed.

2- I recommend that the collinearity test be carried out for each statement as a way of ensuring the absence of multicollinearity bias.

3- I missed the statements in the scales used. Even though these were an adaptation of the TAM model, I think that presenting them in the body of the text (even in an appendix) is a contribution and guarantees the replicability of the study.

4- As the dependent variable was collected at the same time as the independent variables, it is likely that the bias common method bias. I recommend carrying out a test - univariate or multivariate - in order to mitigate this possibility (see in: Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879).

5- The section discussing the results needs to be expanded and deepened. What is the study's theoretical or scientific contribution? What can marketing managers/organizations do with this result? What future research agenda can the authors propose?

6- A final review of spelling and grammar needs to be carried out in order to mitigate the (few) formal errors in the text.

I wish the authors success.

