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|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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.** | **The manuscript addresses a highly relevant and timely issue for the scientific and business community, particularly in the context of developing economies. By evaluating the effectiveness and impact of iProSES—an inventory processing system designed specifically for MSMEs in the food sector—this study offers empirical insights into the integration of digital tools within resource-limited environments. The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods provides a comprehensive understanding of system usability, user satisfaction, and operational efficiency. Furthermore, this research contributes meaningfully to the growing body of literature on technology adoption and digital transformation in MSMEs, offering a replicable model for similar interventions in other sectors or regions. The study's practical implications are valuable for policymakers, software developers, and MSME stakeholders aiming to enhance productivity**  **through technology.** | The project examines how micro and small businesses in developing areas are adopting digital stock-control tools and the impact these tools have on their long-term survival. It studies the iProSES platform, combining interviews with survey results, and then shares practical ideas for policymakers, software developers, and owners alike. By doing so, the team aims to show these firms paths toward greater resilience and smoother day-to-day operations, demonstrating to them—and to everyone else—how innovative technology can drive green growth and a competitive edge after the pandemic. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **In general, the title of this article is quite informative and reflects the content of the research, particularly regarding the subject of study (MSMEs), the system being evaluated (iProSES), and the theoretical framework applied (Technology Acceptance Model). However, the title could still be improved to enhance clarity and academic appeal. The use of the term "Acceptability" may be more appropriately refined to "Adoption" or "Acceptance" to better align with the terminology used in the TAM context. Additionally, the structure of the title could be streamlined to make it more systematic and direct.**  **Suggested Alternative Title:**  **“Evaluating the Acceptance of iProSES: A Web-Based Inventory System for Food-Sector MSMEs Using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)”**  **Or in a more concise version:**  **“Technology Acceptance of iProSES: A Digital Inventory System for Food-Sector MSMEs”** | **In consideration of the reviewers’ suggestions, the authors will use the proposed title: 'Evaluating the Acceptance of iProSES: A Web-Based Inventory System for Food-Sector MSMEs Using the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).** |
| **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 abstract is clear, concise, and effectively summarizes the research objectives, methods, and key findings. It successfully highlights the relevance of iProSES for MSMEs and the use of TAM as a framework. However, to enhance clarity and impact, I suggest briefly contextualizing the study location (MIMAROPA) and simplifying the presentation of numerical results. A stronger concluding sentence on the broader implications would also improve the abstract’s overall strength.** | **The abstract was revised according to the reviewer’s suggestions by clearly identifying and contextualizing the study location, simplifying the presentation of numerical results, and incorporating a stronger concluding sentence that highlights the broader implications of the study.** |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. The study employs an appropriate mixed-methods approach, integrates established models such as TAM and ISO 9126, and presents both qualitative and quantitative analyses. The research design, data collection, and interpretation are methodologically valid, and the findings are relevant and clearly linked to the objectives. Overall, it demonstrates scientific rigor and contributes meaningfully to the literature on MSME digital adoption. | Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically sound, with appropriate referencing of standards (ISO 9126), established models (TAM), and relevant data collection and analysis methods. The integration of qualitative and quantitative data strengthens the validity of the findings. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, the references are generally sufficient, relevant, and up-to-date. The manuscript cites key studies from recent years, including foundational sources on TAM, ISO 9126, and MSME digital transformation. However, to strengthen the theoretical foundation, the authors may consider adding recent peer-reviewed studies from 2023–  2024 on post-pandemic digital adoption trends in MSMEs. | **The authors have included additional peer-reviewed studies from 2023 to 2024 on post-pandemic digital adoption trends in MSMEs.** |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | Yes, the English language used in the manuscript is clear, grammatically sound, and appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor edits may improve flow, but overall, the language does not hinder comprehension or the presentation of scientific ideas. | **The authors have improved the overall quality of the paper's writing.** |
| **Optional/General** comments | **This manuscript addresses a timely and practical issue with clear methodology and relevant findings. Its focus on MSMEs and digital transformation adds valuable insight to current literature. With minor refinements, it has strong potential for publication and real-world impact.** | By weaving together technical details and user concerns, the article speaks to researchers and practitioners alike. |
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| **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)* | The manuscript is free from any ethical concerns. |