

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125147
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF CLOUD COMPUTING ADOPTION AMONGST SMES IN THE UK TECHNOLOGY SECTOR.
Type of the Article	Research Study and Statistical Analysis on Technology Adoption among SMEs

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript has some relevance for the scientific community as it tries to analyse the determinants of cloud computing adoption among SMEs in the UK technology sector.</p> <p>By leveraging the Technology-Organization-Environment (TOE) framework, the study discusses on key factors such as organizational support, technological compatibility, and competitive pressures that influence cloud adoption.</p> <p>However, these type of studies with only TOE cannot provide the full picture. The study should improve by including the latest models like UTAUT2 and TAM5. These models focus on individual behavior, consumer adoption, and the changing nature of technology, giving a better understanding of how users accept and adopt technology.</p> <p>Increasing the number of survey participants and ensuring a diverse sample would make the findings more robust. A larger and more varied sample can give a more accurate representation of the SME sector. This is a must requirement.</p> <p>How was the survey conducted? Is it online? If yes How? How many questionnaires were there in the survey? Who were the target responders? Did the enquiry happen in CXO lever where decision making happens or is it the end user employees who will use the technology? What were the options in the questionnaire? How are we sure that the set of questions will reveal our outcome as per hypothesis?</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>As per this paper is concerned, the abstract provides relevant points that are there in the remaining sections of the manuscript. However, as mentioned above, only TOE cant be applied single handedly to determine the cloud adoption by SMEs. UTAUT2 is a comprehensive model covering different models and TAM5 is another latest model where it encompasses the various limitations in TOE. Ultimately, the end users will be using the Cloud system on regular basis and individual factors like hedonic motivation, habit, personal traits (UTAUT2), trust, attitude, and technology readiness are not considered in TOE.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The author should present a detailed analogy as why TOE has been chosen out of the various other techniques and only 102 SMEs are too little number in the scope of Survey. In above, I had mentioned the lack of clarity in the survey which is very much vital to understand the authenticity. Incorporating UTAUT2 and TAM5 into the analysis will fill these gaps by providing a more complete understanding of both organizational and individual adoption. It would help capture critical factors like user motivation, social influence, and the psychological aspects that drive technology adoption in today's world. These models also make it easier to study emerging technologies and trends, ensuring that the framework remains relevant in rapidly evolving technology markets. As technology rapidly evolves, including areas like AI, blockchain, and cloud computing, TOE's static framework struggles to keep pace with these changes. UTAUT2 and TAM5 are more flexible, making it easier to adapt to emerging consumer technologies by incorporating new variables that affect user adoption. TOE primarily emphasizes organizational and environmental factors but overlooks individual user behavior and personal experiences. In contrast, UTAUT2 focuses on individual behavior, such as</p>	

Review Form 3

	personal motivation, ease of use, and social influences, which are critical in understanding how modern users adopt technology like mobile apps, social media platforms, and other consumer technologies. A hybrid approach is preferred in such studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are grossly inadequate. We would prefer maximum references for last 6-7 years to understand the literature gaps properly in the latest articles.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Apart from few areas where there is typo and recommend proof reading.	
Optional/General comments	The writer should either use a Hybrid model with increasing number of survey responders (min 500+) and provide the details of the survey process or should provide detailed reason as why other techniques are not chosen when UTAUT2 combines various other models. There are multiple disadvantages in TOE. This needs to be clearly mentioned as how this manuscript is tacking those disadvantages in this research.	

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:	Aveek Basu
Department, University & Country	BIT, India