

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129857
Title of the Manuscript:	Crowdfunding Adoption of Startup Entrepreneurs in Developing Context: An Application of the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology Model
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a highly relevant issue in the entrepreneurial ecosystem, particularly in developing nations, by exploring the determinants of crowdfunding adoption. The use of the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) model adds robustness to the analysis and bridges gaps in the literature concerning the adoption of innovative financing mechanisms. Insights from this study could guide policymakers and platform developers to enhance crowdfunding's accessibility and efficacy. Additionally, it offers valuable contributions by focusing on Sri Lanka, a region with limited prior research on this topic.	These are complements. Thank you.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title effectively reflects the study’s focus and methodology. However, for improved clarity and brevity, consider: “Adoption of Crowdfunding by Startup Entrepreneurs in Sri Lanka: A UTAUT Model Application.”	Title has been amended as ‘Adoption of Crowdfunding by Startup Entrepreneurs in Developing Context: UTAUT Model Application in Sri Lanka’
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.	The title effectively reflects the study’s focus and methodology. However, for improved clarity and brevity, consider: “Adoption of Crowdfunding by Startup Entrepreneurs in Sri Lanka: A UTAUT Model Application.”	Title has been amended as ‘Adoption of Crowdfunding by Startup Entrepreneurs in Developing Context: UTAUT Model Application in Sri Lanka’
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, employing a well-established theoretical framework and robust methodology. However, some sections lack clarity, particularly the justification for choosing the UTAUT model over alternative frameworks. Addressing this will strengthen the argument.	Explanation on using UTAUT model has been included.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and recent, covering essential works related to crowdfunding and UTAUT. Nevertheless, adding more context-specific references focusing on Sri Lanka’s entrepreneurial challenges could enhance the literature review’s depth.	The context-specific explanation has been included.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical issues (e.g., subject-verb agreement) and awkward phrasing (e.g., “statistical reliability ensures statistical reliability”) should be revised for smoother readability.	The paper has been exercised professional language editing.
Optional/General comments	<div>The manuscript could benefit from:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Greater emphasis on cross-cultural insights to broaden its appeal.A detailed discussion of how findings align or deviate from prior studies.Clearer integration of findings into the broader discourse on entrepreneurial financing in developing economies.</div> <div>Comments for Improvement:<ol style="list-style-type: none">Revise the abstract for conciseness and clarity.Include a justification for selecting the UTAUT model over alternatives.Address minor grammatical issues and improve phrasing.Expand the discussion to include cross-cultural comparisons and align findings with existing literature.Add a clear statement about ethical clearance for data collection.</div>	<div>Abstract comprehensively explain aim, design, findings, implication and limitation of the study.</div> <div>Ethical clearance statement was included.</div>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	