Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_3464**
Title of the Manuscript:	**USING TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE MODEL TO PROMOTE STUDENTS ADOPTION AND USE OF DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN THE SUNYANI TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**
Type of the Article	**Book chapter**

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback***(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the adoption and use of digital technologies in educational settings, specifically within the context of SUNYANI Technical University. However, if the intended audience of the journal is more global, the paper would benefit from a comparative analysis with national or global patterns, or similar studies, to contextualize the findings within a broader framework. This would allow readers to better understand the relevance of the study beyond a local context and make connections to global trends in digital technology adoption in education. Additionally, including a discussion on the practical implications of the findings for policy makers, educators, and technology developers would enhance the manuscript's impact and relevance to a wider audience	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Title and the conclusion of the paper doesnot align. Based on paper, tha goal of the study seems to be understanding of the adoption so title should be refined- one suggestion - Applying the Technology Acceptance Model to Understand Student Adoption of Digital Technologies at Sunyani Technical University	
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 does a solid job outlining the study's use of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to examine student adoption of digital technology at Sunyani Technical University. However, a few tweaks could make it clearer and more engaging. It would help if the purpose of the study were stated upfront to quickly orient readers. A brief mention of the quantitative approach—perhaps the sample size or data collection methods—would add clarity to the research process. Some sections of the abstract feel a bit repetitive, especially regarding students' positive attitudes. Streamlining these could create more room to highlight key findings, like the 78.8% positive response rate, which adds weight to the study's outcomes. Focusing on how TAM specifically contributed to the students' improved perceptions of digital technology would help readers appreciate the study's practical impact in promoting flexible, self-paced learning.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript includes essential sections on **Descriptive Statistics** and **Likert Scale Analysis**, which provide a solid foundation for analyzing students' adoption of digital technologies. However, to strengthen the analysis and provide readers with a clearer view of the study's findings, I suggest adding an additional sections: **Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)**: Including a preliminary EDA section would offer a broader understanding of the dataset. Summarizing key demographic information(gender wise, age wise) or general technology usage patterns could provide valuable context before delving into the specific analyses. This addition would enhance readers' comprehension of the data landscape. Also, answer the why you use the histpgram and table? On what basis you think would epitomize the distribution of dataset. Are there other graphs to better represent the data?	

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the adoption and use of digital technologies in educational settings, specifically within the context of SUNYANI Technical University. However, if the intended audience of the journal is more global, the paper would benefit from a comparative analysis with national or global patterns, or similar studies, to contextualize the findings within a broader framework. This would allow readers to better understand the relevance of the study beyond a local context and make connections to global trends in digital technology adoption in education. Additionally, including a discussion on the practical implications of the findings for policy makers, educators, and technology developers would enhance the manuscript's impact and relevance to a wider audience	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are mostly from past paper, as the COVID has introduced more tech into education it is better to include recent paper from 2019 onwards too.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. Include a comparative analysis with national or global studies on technology adoption in education to contextualize the findings within a broader framework. This will help make the results more relevant to a global audience. 2. Add more recent references focusing on current trends in digital technology adoption, e-learning, and mobile learning, particularly in the post-pandemic era. 3. Discuss the practical implications of the findings for educators, policymakers, and technology developers, providing actionable insights for improving digital technology integration in education.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mala Deep Upadhaya**
Department, University & Country	**Coventry University, Nepal**