International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Perceived Usefulness and Ease of Use as Predictors of Behavioral Intention to Adopt ChatGPT in Higher Education
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations
The manuscript shows considerable potential; however, revisions are necessary to improve its clarity, coherence, and overall effectiveness. The authors are encouraged to thoroughly address and incorporate all reviewer feedback in the revised version.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations
The manuscript provides a timely and highly relevant investigation into the adoption of ChatGPT among undergraduate students in Southern Negros, utilizing the Technology Acceptance Model. Given the rapid integration of AI in local higher education and the CHED's recent pronouncements, this localized perspective is a welcome contribution to the literature.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
1. The authors explicitly state in the Introduction and Methodology that this paper focuses strictly on three TAM constructs: Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEU), and Behavioral Intention (BI). However, when reporting the Multiple Regression Analysis, the authors suddenly include "Information Verification (IV)," "RAU," and "Ethical Concerns (EC)" as predictors or covariates. A manuscript must be completely self-contained. You cannot include variables in your statistical models if they were never conceptualized in the Introduction or operationalized in the Methodology. If EC, IV, and RAU are part of the model, they must be fully defined and their survey items explained. If this paper is truly just a subset focusing on PU, PEU, and BI, then the regression model should be re-run exclusively with these variables.
2. There is a severe construct validity issue in the findings. The EFA results indicate that PU and BI loaded together onto the exact same factor (Factor 2: AI Adoption and Utility). Statistically, if PU and BI are not distinct factors and belong to the same construct, it is highly problematic to then use PU to predict BI in a multiple regression model. This introduces severe multicollinearity and violates the basic assumptions of regression (you are essentially regressing a construct onto itself). The authors need to provide a robust statistical justification for treating them as independent and dependent variables despite the EFA results, or they need to restructure their analytical approach entirely.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

3. Throughout the methodology, the authors justify their instrument's validity (e.g., KMO and Bartlett's test) based on the full 30-item instrument from the larger study. Since this manuscript only evaluates 15 specific items to measure PU, PEU, and BI, the psychometric properties, factor loadings, and construct validity metrics must be reported specifically for these 15 items. Reporting the KMO for 30 items when you are only analyzing half of them in this paper misrepresents the data. Please extract and compute the EFA solely for the items utilized in this manuscript.
4. The study utilizes convenience sampling via an online Google Form. While this is a practical approach, it inherently introduces selection bias. Students who are offline, lack digital infrastructure, or do not check online platforms regularly are excluded. The authors make broad recommendations for regional Philippine HEIs based on these findings. The discussion needs to explicitly address how convenience sampling might have skewed the findings (for instance, the high frequency of use might just be reflective of the highly connected students who answered the form). The claims in the conclusion should be softened to reflect this limitation.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

Decision	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations
This paper is timely and relevant and the use of TAM to explain ChatGPT adoption in higher education is generally appropriate. The dataset is also good in size and the results show a potentially useful contribution for local higher education context. However, my main concern is that the manuscript is trying to present itself as a focused TAM paper but the analytical structure is not yet fully consistent with that claim. Because of this, the paper becomes less clear in its theoretical direction and some parts of the results and interpretation look mixed with a bigger study rather than a stand-alone manuscript. This issue should be addressed first because it affects the overall strength of the paper.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
The main problem for me is the mismatch between the declared scope of the paper and the way the analysis was actually done. The paper says it focuses on three core TAM constructs only namely perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and behavioral intention. But in the factor analysis and regression analysis, the manuscript brings in other constructs from the larger instrument, such as information verification, responsible AI use, ethical concerns, and others, without giving enough explanation why these are still included in a paper that claims to be a focused TAM-based study. This makes the paper look conceptually divided. If this is really

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

a TAM-focused paper, then the authors need to align the analyses more strictly with TAM and present a cleaner model centered on PU, PEU, and BI only. If they want to retain the broader variables from the larger study, then the paper should be reframed more honestly as a partial model from a multidimensional AI attitude framework, not purely as a TAM paper. Related to this, the factor analysis also needs more careful justification because the reported factor structure does not fully look like a straightforward validation of the three focal constructs, especially when PU and BI merged together while PEU loaded with another non-TAM domain. This is interesting but it should not be over claimed as confirming TAM without deeper explanation. In the same way, the regression table appears incomplete because the text says five predictors were entered, but only some are shown in the table. This should be corrected for transparency. Overall, I suggest the authors revise the manuscript by making the theoretical framing, analytic scope and interpretation fully consistent with each other. Once this is clarified, the paper will become much stronger and easier to appreciate.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

Decision	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

Decision	**Editor**	**Reviewer 1**	**Reviewer 2**
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			