

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_108363
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Technology Acceptance Model in Examining Students' Behavioural Intention to Use Virtual Meeting Technology: A Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling Approach.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important as virtual meeting using technology nowadays provide more convenience and easy to use as people could connect from different place and from far distance.</p> <p>The title is direct and clear. However, the researcher may add the state/country the research have been done to the title.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is very clear and complete with all the input needed in abstract. However, for keywords, I suggest combining SEM and PLS to the keyword of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM), added with perceived usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), and remain others. It is because in this paper, the researcher used PLS-SEM, not CB-SEM, thus write PLS-SEM in one word.</p> <p>Yes, very clear and structured.</p> <p>Yes, satisfied with the manuscript. However, the researcher may improve at figure 1, for the model. An arrow missing from Behaviour Intention to Actual Use.</p> <p>Yes, it is sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, fluent English used.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please improve the model in figure 1 and keywords.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Musyirah Binti Wan Ismail
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia