Detailed Response to Reviewer Comments

We appreciate the reviewers' thorough and constructive comments. We have carefully considered all suggestions and made substantial revisions to improve the quality of the manuscript. Below, we provide a detailed response to each comment, including explanations for the changes made and references to the relevant sections in the revised manuscript.

# Reviewer 1:

Comment 1: In the introduction, there is insufficient background on the related literature. More context is required to support the significance of the study, especially in relation to recent advancements in the field.

Response: Thank you for highlighting this. We have significantly expanded the introduction to include more recent literature, particularly focusing on studies published in the last five years that align with the current research topic. This information has been added to page 3, paragraphs 2 and 3. The new citations include [Author et al., 2020] and [Researcher et al., 2021], which provide a broader context for the study's significance.

Changes made: Revised introduction on page 3, paragraph 2-3.

Comment 2: The theoretical framework is not fully developed. How does your study build upon existing theories in the field?

Response: We appreciate your suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have now elaborated on the theoretical framework by clearly linking our research questions to existing theories, particularly the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Diffusion of Innovations Theory. This addition strengthens the justification for our study. The relevant text can be found on page 4, paragraphs 1 and 2.

Changes made: Expanded theoretical framework on page 4, paragraphs 1-2.

# Reviewer 2:

Comment 1: The sample selection method is not clearly described. Please provide more details on the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants.

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have provided a more comprehensive description of the sample selection process, including specific details on inclusion and exclusion criteria, which were previously underexplained. The revised version now specifies the age range, professional background, and other relevant factors for participant selection. This can be found on page 5, section 'Sample Selection'.

Changes made: Added detailed description of sample selection process on page 5, section 'Sample Selection'.

Comment 2: How was the sample size determined? The current explanation is insufficient.

Response: We agree that the explanation for determining the sample size required further clarification. In the revised manuscript, we have included a detailed description of the sample size calculation based on power analysis, with references to appropriate statistical guidelines. This information can now be found on page 6, paragraph 1.

Changes made: Explanation of sample size determination on page 6, paragraph 1.

# Reviewer 3:

Comment 1: The statistical analysis section is unclear, particularly how you accounted for potential confounding variables.

Response: Thank you for your observation. We have revised the statistical analysis section to provide more clarity on how confounding variables were controlled. Specifically, we have added a subsection detailing the multivariate regression models used and the rationale for including specific covariates. These revisions can be found on page 7, paragraph 2.

Changes made: Clarified statistical analysis and control for confounding variables on page 7, paragraph 2.

Comment 2: The results are presented clearly, but the discussion lacks depth in interpreting the findings in light of existing research.

Response: We appreciate your insight. The discussion section has been revised to include a more in-depth comparison of our findings with those from previous studies. We have also expanded on the implications of our results for both theory and practice. This can now be found on page 9, paragraphs 2-4.

Changes made: Expanded discussion on pages 9, paragraphs 2-4.

We believe these revisions address the concerns raised by the reviewers, and we are confident that the manuscript has been substantially improved. Thank you again for your constructive feedback. We look forward to the continued review process.