



Paper: “The Mediating Role of Change Management Between Technology Readiness and Job Performance”

Submitted: 15 June 2025

Accepted: 05 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Samer Hamad

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n25p89

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 27.06.25	Date Review Report Submitted: 03.07.25.
Manuscript Title: The Mediating Role of Change Management Between Technology Readiness and Job Performance	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29. 04.07.25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: NO	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Yes, it is consistent</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>Literature gap does not emerge clearly. Introduction and literature background provide definitions of the main concepts, however, is not clear what is the real contribution of this work in literature, and why these concepts must be explored together. Recent studies have been neglected. I suggest to improve literature background detailing better the literature gap and the originality of the study.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	NO – 5
<i>Some typo are present, not relevant spelling mistakes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

I suggest providing references about the metrics and items applied for readiness, job performance and change management, detailing previous studies that validated these constructs. The research model is not clear; what is the dependent variable? What are the independent and the control variables? More details about sample selection (nationality, job role, time...) and the control variables (why?) might be appreciated. Although SEM approach as a whole has been well introduced, authors fail in explaining why they adopt the PLS methodology, SEM has many approaches....why PLS? I suggest to remain consistent in justify SEM considering only literature related to the topic...the general use of SEM in management studies or finance are not relevant.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

2

Fig. 1 is not clear, I can't see the values. Descriptive stats about the sample are requested. Also, tables in appendix are not so easy to read....I suggest a clear and defined structure. Discussion must be improved in terms of theoretical and managerial implications, they are a simple description of quantitative results without a critical interpretation of possible reasons and effects.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

3

I suggest to detail better practical implications, limitations and future research. I have some concerns about the institutional perspective recalled in theoretical contribution. Institutional setting does not emerge here as factors or variable...I can't see if the respondents belong with different firms, different countries...

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

3

I suggest considering more recent literature on the topic (organizational change and technology innovation). Most of the literature dates back to before 2016.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the evaluation form

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: