

Peer Review

Review of: "Context Matters: A Note on the Special Conditions for Effective AI Adoption in Organizations"

Angela Hecimovic¹

1. Business School, Discipline of Accounting, Governance & Regulation, University of Sydney, Australia

This research note explores the prerequisites for effective and ethical adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within organisational contexts. It argues that successful AI integration requires more than technological capability; it depends on a constellation of interrelated “special conditions,” including leadership commitment, ethical governance, data ecosystem readiness, cultural adaptability, sectoral and institutional constraints, and strategic alignment. Drawing on interdisciplinary literature and sectoral examples, the paper proposes a conceptual framework aimed at guiding context-sensitive AI deployment.

The paper offers a timely and valuable perspective on AI adoption, moving beyond technology-centric discussions. By foregrounding contextual enablers and constraints, the author contributes to a growing strand of literature that frames AI as a socio-technical system. The commentary is particularly helpful for practitioners, policymakers, and academics who seek to understand why many AI initiatives fail or remain superficial despite technical feasibility. The framework presented is conceptually sound and practically oriented.

The author successfully integrates ethical, organisational, and strategic dimensions—elements often treated in isolation in other AI implementation research studies; however, it could embed more empirics. The paper is logical and easy to follow, with clearly labelled sections; however, the prose in some sections is occasionally repetitive (*e.g., the repeated assertion that AI needs to align with strategic goals and ethical principles*). A more concise articulation of overlapping ideas would improve flow and streamline the narrative.

The literature is well-referenced, with a broad range of interdisciplinary sources that include recent publications from management, healthcare, public administration, and AI ethics. The inclusion of real-world examples (*e.g., the UK A-Level grading algorithm*) enhances the relevance and applicability of the

discussion. The author could strengthen the theoretical underpinnings by more explicitly situating the framework within existing models of organisational change or technology adoption (e.g., TOE framework, Institutional Theory, or the Technology Acceptance Model). This would bolster the conceptual rigour of the note.

The paper's identified conditions provide a pragmatic lens for evaluating readiness and sustainability, and future work could expand on this by operationalising the conditions into a diagnostic tool or maturity model, which would further enhance the practical utility of the framework. The conclusion reiterates the central argument effectively and suggests future research directions, including comparative case studies and mixed-method approaches.

Overall, this is a well-written and conceptually relevant contribution that highlights the non-technological dimensions of AI adoption. While the paper is presented as a note rather than a full empirical study, its insights are grounded in contemporary literature and practical considerations and are well suited for academics looking for future research ideas on AI integration.

Enjoyed the read, and thanks for some thoughtful ideas for future research, Angela

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.