

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_110746
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Utilizing Technology in Small and Medium Enterprises in Sri Lanka: Quantitative and Qualitative Investigation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p>1. The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community, particularly for researchers and practitioners interested in understanding the factors influencing technology adoption in SMEs. The study provides a comprehensive analysis of organizational, environmental, and technological factors, contributing valuable insights to the field of SME growth and technology adoption.</p> <p>2. The title is generally suitable for the content of the manuscript as it clearly indicates the focus on technology adoption in SMEs. However, it could be enhanced for clarity and specificity. An alternative title could be "Exploring Constraints and Catalysts: A Comprehensive Analysis of Technology Adoption in Sri Lankan SMEs."</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key aspects of the manuscript, including the objectives, methodology, major findings, and implications. It provides a clear overview for readers to understand the study's scope and contributions.</p> <p>4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript appear well-organized. The separation into sections such as "Content Analysis Summary," "Discussion," and "Implications" follows a logical flow, aiding readers in navigating the content.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a robust methodology and analysis. The integration of both qualitative and quantitative data strengthens the credibility of the findings. The discussion aligns with the study's objectives and is supported by relevant literature.</p> <p>6. The references provided are diverse and cover a wide range of relevant literature. However, it might be beneficial to ensure that the references are up-to-date, especially in a rapidly evolving field such as technology adoption. Consider incorporating more recent studies or publications to enhance the currency of the review.</p> <p>Additional references for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology. Harvard Business Press.</li><li>Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of Innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.</li><li>Venkatesh, V., &amp; Bala, H. (2008). Technology Acceptance Model 3 and a Research Agenda on Interventions. Decision Sciences, 39(2), 273–315.</li></ul> <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-structured, contributes meaningfully to the scientific community, and could benefit from slight improvements in the title and the inclusion of more recent references.</p> <p><b><u>Additional suggestions/comments</u></b></p> <p><b>Clarity in Language:</b> While the manuscript is generally well-written, there are a few instances where the language could be further clarified for better comprehension. For instance, in the "Discussion" section, consider rephrasing complex sentences to enhance readability.</p> <p><b>In-Text Citations:</b> Ensure consistent and correct formatting of in-text citations throughout the manuscript. This helps maintain clarity and follows a standardized citation style.</p> <p><b>Integration of Qualitative Insights:</b> While the quantitative analysis is thorough, consider further integration of qualitative insights throughout the manuscript. This can provide a more holistic understanding of the factors influencing technology adoption.</p>	<p>This is a compliment. Thank you.</p> <p>The title has been revised as suggested by the reviewer.</p> <p>This is a compliment. Thank you.</p> <p>This is a compliment. Thank you.</p> <p>This is a compliment. Thank you.</p> <p>Recent literatures have been included.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p><b>Highlighting Practical Implications:</b> Emphasize the practical implications of the findings for SME owners and policymakers. How can the identified factors be leveraged to facilitate technology adoption? Providing actionable insights will enhance the manuscript's applied significance.</p> <p><b>Future Research Directions:</b> Expand on the "Further Research Suggestions" section by providing more specific and detailed directions for future research. Highlight potential gaps in the current study that could be explored in subsequent research.</p> <p><b>Consistency in Terminology:</b> Ensure consistency in the use of terminology and acronyms throughout the manuscript. This contributes to a smoother reading experience and prevents potential confusion.</p> <p><b>Conciseness in Tables:</b> Tables, especially Table 5, are comprehensive. Ensure that the information presented is essential and directly contributes to the reader's understanding. Consider breaking down complex tables into smaller, focused ones for clarity.</p>	Table 5 has been revised cording to the reviewer comments.
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written and demonstrates a good command of English. However, there are a few instances where sentence structures could be further clarified for enhanced readability, and minor grammatical improvements could be made. Additionally, some sentences in the "Discussion" section are complex, and simplifying them could improve overall comprehension. Overall, a thorough proofreading to address these minor language-related aspects would contribute to the manuscript's overall quality.	Necessary amendments have been taken.
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)	