

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3861
Title of the Manuscript:	KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING USERS' INTENTIONS OF ADOPTING RENEWABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes significantly to the understanding of factors influencing the adoption of renewable energy technologies (RET), a critical area in addressing global energy sustainability challenges. By integrating established theoretical frameworks such as TRA, TAM, and DOI, the study provides a robust basis for exploring behavioral intentions. Its focus on Taiwan offers valuable localized insights, which could inspire comparative studies in other regions. The findings also provide actionable strategies for policymakers and technology promoters to enhance the adoption of RETs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, Key Factors Influencing Users' Intentions of Adopting Renewable Energy Technologies, is clear but could be more specific to highlight the study's theoretical integration and regional focus. Suggested alternative title: Behavioral Intention to Adopt Renewable Energy Technologies: Insights from Taiwan Using TRA, TAM, and DOI Models.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved by including specific findings, such as which factors had the greatest influence on behavioral intention. Additionally, emphasizing the practical implications for policymakers would strengthen the impact. For example: Include the finding that perceived usefulness had the most significant effect. Mention the sample size (273 respondents) and regional focus (Taiwan).	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with a well-structured methodology and valid use of statistical tools like structural equation modeling. However, the discussion could more thoroughly contextualize findings in the broader literature. Addressing limitations, such as the regional focus and sampling bias, would enhance the rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are adequate but slightly outdated, particularly for theoretical frameworks like TAM. Including recent studies on RET adoption from the past five years would add relevance. Suggested references include: [Recent studies on TAM extensions in energy contexts.] [Global comparative analyses on RET adoption.]	

[Review Form 3](#)

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript requires significant language editing to ensure clarity and professionalism. Issues include awkward phrasing, grammatical errors, and inconsistent terminology. Consider professional proofreading for scholarly quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is valuable but would benefit from:</p> <p>Greater emphasis on practical implications for other countries. Clearer articulation of the interrelation between the three theoretical frameworks. Additional visual aids, such as flowcharts or summary tables, to improve readability.</p> <p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>Manuscript Title: The title is clear but could be made more engaging and specific to the manuscript's focus. Consider the suggested alternative to highlight the theoretical framework and regional context.</p> <p>Abstract Clarity: The abstract effectively summarizes the manuscript but lacks specificity in terms of key findings and practical implications. Including numerical results, such as statistical significance levels or path coefficients, would enhance its value for readers.</p> <p>Language and Grammar: The manuscript requires careful editing for grammatical accuracy and scholarly tone. Common issues include awkward sentence structure, inconsistent use of terminology, and typographical errors. Professional language editing is strongly recommended before publication.</p> <p>Figures and Tables: Ensure that all figures and tables are self-explanatory and adequately described in the text. Labels and captions must align with the discussion for better reader comprehension.</p> <p>Theoretical Integration: While the manuscript integrates TRA, TAM, and DOI effectively, the interrelation between these frameworks could be better articulated. A conceptual diagram explaining the connections and hypotheses could be valuable.</p> <p>Recent References: The manuscript relies heavily on older sources. Including references from the past five years, particularly those focused on RET adoption in similar contexts, would improve the manuscript's relevance and credibility.</p> <p>Ethical Statements: Although the manuscript appears to follow ethical research practices, explicitly stating the process for obtaining informed consent and addressing confidentiality would align it with standard ethical guidelines.</p> <p>Practical Implications: The manuscript provides actionable recommendations, but these could be expanded further. Offering specific strategies that policymakers and technology promoters in other regions could adopt would enhance its global applicability.</p> <p>There are no apparent ethical issues in the manuscript. The research adheres to standard data collection practices, but it would be helpful to mention whether informed consent was obtained from respondents. There are no indications of competing interest issues in this manuscript. No signs of plagiarism were detected from the provided text. If there is a suspicion, specific sections should be checked using plagiarism detection tools for verification.</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anak Agung Gde Satia Utama
Department, University & Country	Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia