



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Digital Transformation Readiness and User Acceptance of an Integrated Management Information System in a Public HEI in Northern Mindanao
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript presents a highly relevant and timely topic, especially given the continuous push for digital transformation, quality assurance, and data-driven academic management in Philippine Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Assessing organizational readiness before a full-scale rollout of an Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) is a commendable institutional initiative.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The authors explicitly mentioned that they used TAM and UTAUT as theoretical frameworks. However, the data analysis only utilized Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) multiple linear regression on three constructs: Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, and Facilitating Conditions. Furthermore, the authors deliberately stated that "There is no advanced statistical modeling used, such as Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) or Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)". I strongly suggest reconsidering this stance. In journal publications dealing with UTAUT and TAM, running at least a CFA or PLS-SEM is standard practice to establish construct validity and model fit. Basic OLS regression is insufficient for testing complex behavioral intention models, as it does not account for measurement errors in the latent variables.



The methodology states that the instrument's reliability was "ensured through item consistency". However, there is no statistical evidence provided in the results to back this up. Please include the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients or Composite Reliability scores for each of your constructs (PE, EE, FC). Without this, the reader cannot be sure if the survey items actually measure what they are supposed to measure consistently.

The study used purposive sampling with 100 respondents. To establish empirical validity, the authors need to present the total population of active system users in NBSC. Is 100 an adequate sample size? Please provide a sample size justification (e.g., using G*Power or Slovin's formula) to prove that the 100 respondents genuinely represent the faculty and administrative personnel of the institution.

Section F (Data Analysis Techniques) and Figure 1 (Data Analysis Technique) read like an undergraduate IT thesis. Explaining that data was cleaned in Python, or that "Excellent" was translated to 5 and "Poor" to 1, is too elementary for IJTMS. I suggest removing Figure 1 entirely and condensing Section F into a single, concise paragraph focusing purely on the statistical tests applied rather than the software mechanics.

The findings highlight a "critically low" score ($M = 0.63$) in training. This is a massive red flag for operational readiness. While the regression implies Facilitating Conditions drive satisfaction, the discussion needs to connect this back to broader HEI contexts. How does this training gap reflect systemic issues in public HEIs in the Philippines? The discussion should go beyond NBSC and offer insights that other academic leaders and quality assurance teams can use when drafting their own digital transformation roadmaps.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	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

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper is timely and relevant because digital transformation readiness is an important concern for public HEIs, especially before implementing a larger system like IMIS. The manuscript has a clear practical value because it identifies that users generally accept the present system but there is still a weakness in structured training and orientation. This is a useful finding for institutional planning. However, the main concern that needs to be improved is the methodological and analytical consistency, especially in how the study measures "readiness" and how the training score is treated in the analysis.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
My main concern is that the paper presents a strong conclusion that NBSC is only "partially ready" for IMIS mainly because training received a very low mean score of 0.63, but the measurement and scoring of this training variable is not yet clearly justified. The methodology



says the survey used a 1–5 Likert scale, and answers with “0” or “Never requested support” were treated as missing values, but in the results, training is reported as 0.63, which is outside the stated 1–5 scale. This creates confusion because it is not clear whether training was measured as a yes/no variable, frequency variable, missing-value problem, or Likert-scale construct. Because this training score becomes the central evidence for the paper’s main conclusion and recommendation, the authors need to explain clearly how this value was computed, what items were included, and whether it is statistically comparable with other constructs such as technical support and responsiveness. Also, the regression section needs to be checked because the coefficient for Facilitating Conditions is reported differently in the equation and in the explanation, and the claim that it is the “strongest predictor” should be made carefully if the coefficients are unstandardized and the variables may not be measured on the same scale. To strengthen the paper, the authors should revise the methods and results so that all constructs, scoring procedures, missing-value treatment, and regression interpretation are aligned and transparent. This will make the conclusion more credible and will help readers trust that the readiness assessment is based on a sound and consistent analysis.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	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

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
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.			