

Reviewer 4

Comment1: “On page 5, line 233. About "Hc1: IQ positively influences the use of the e-learning system". It should be changed to "H1c: IQ positively influences the use of the e-learning system".

Response1: The comment has been addressed and corrected.

Comment2: “About Section Abstract, on page 1, line 21-24. " By relying on the related literature review, an extensive model is developed by integrating the information system (IS) success model and technology acceptance model (TAM) to illustrate key factors that influence the success of e-learning systems. " The keyword " information system (IS) success model " should be written as (ISSM)”.

Response2: The comment has been addressed and corrected.

Comment3: “On page 3, lines 91-93. About "Researchers of the second stream have been inclined to integrate various other frame works, such as the IS success model [25], theory of planned behavior [20], and TAM [17] along with the IS continuance model." Regarding "IS success model" and "theory of planned behavior", the abbreviated remarks can be used for the first time, and this abbreviation can be used for subsequent expressions. For example, "Researchers of the second stream have been inclined to integrate various other frame works, such as the IS success model (ISSM) [25], theory of planned behavior (TPB) [20], and TAM [17] along with the IS continuance model." It is suggested that the author(s) can re-examine all related nouns in the article. In this way, more concise words can appear in the article, and it can be more clear”.

Response3: The comment has been addressed and the suggested corrections have been made.

Comment4: “On page 10, line 439. About Section 7. Data Analysis. Suggest the author(s) should change Section 5. Result. And please add this paragraph to explain the common-method variance (CMV) of this research. It would be better let readers to understand whether the CMV's situation in this study is not serious”.

Response4: the section title has been changed from “data analysis” to “results”. Additionally, the common-method variance (CMV) test has been added. The following statement has been added.

“The test of Harman’s one factor was performed to assess the presence of the common-method variance (CMV) [72]. Accordingly, An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was executed, and all measurement items were factorized into a one single factor. The result demonstrates that ten factors emerged, as none of these factors accounts for $\geq 50\%$ of variance among the measurement items. hence, the absence of CMV was evident”.

Comment5: “On page 12, lines 478-481. About the analysis of heterotrait–monotrait ratio approach, Suggest the authors should try to add the reference. It would be better to present the situation of discriminant validity. The authors could reference the below literature. Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M. & Sarstedt, M. A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. J. of the Acad. Mark. Sci. 43, 115–135 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8> Or the author(s) forgot to cite the relevant references in this paragraph, it is recommended to add the source of the relevant references”.

Response5: The comment has been addressed and the suggested reference has been added.

Comment6: “ON page 12, line 484. About Section 7.1. Model Fit Indices. Suggest the author(s) should change Section 5.2. Model Fit Indices. And Suggest trying to show the Goodness of Fit (GOF), one more indicator for readers to understand this study's Model Fit.”

Response6: the comment has been addressed and the suggested correction has been made.

Comment7: “On page 12, lines 494-501. Regarding the suggestions made by Hair et al. [72], the research framework must be a formative indicator. For example, The variance inflation factor (VIF) is often used to evaluate collinearity of the formative indicators. (Hair et al. [72], p10) According to this research framework, it should be a reflective indicator. If this research is not a formative indicator, it is recommended to delete the content from line 494 to line 499. And delete Table 6. The author is needed to confirm that the research structure is a formative or reflective indicator, and then appropriately modify the relevant content”.

Response7: We appreciate the reviewer's comment, and we do confirm the validity of the comment that the collinearity evaluation must be perform for formative indicators. However, the collinearity evaluation using the VIF values is used for the inner model (among constructs), which in this case become (formative). We clarified this issue by stating that “collinearity was evaluated using the values of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of inner model (among constructs)”.

Comment8: “Regarding Table 3 on page 11 and Table 4 on page 12, it is recommended to add a note at the bottom of the table. List the full names of relevant abbreviations for readers to read and identify”.

Response8: the comment has been addressed and corrections have been made.

Comment9:” About Section Abstract, on page 1, line 21-24. " By relying on the related literature review, an extensive model is developed by integrating the information system (IS) success model and technology acceptance model (TAM) to illustrate key factors that influence the success of e-learning systems. " The keyword " information system (IS) success model " should be written as (ISSM)”.

Response9: the comment has been addressed and the correction has been made.

Comment10:” And suggest that the author(s) can add a figure to present this research model. It would help the reader to know the architecture.”.

Response10: the suggested figure has been added.

Comment11: “20. On page 15, line 527. About Section 8. Discussion. Suggest the author(s) should change Section 6. Discussion and Conclusions. And added a subtitle 6.1. Discussion on line 528. Such an article structure and title can make the content clearer for readers. 21. On page 17, line 619. About Section 9. Research Implications. Suggest the author(s) should delete the line. And on line 620, about change Section 9.1 Theoretical Implications. Suggest the author(s) should change Section 6.2. Theoretical Implications. On page 17, line 647. About Section 9.2. Practical Implications. Suggest the author(s) should change Section 6.3. Practical Implications. 22. On page 18, line 713. About Section 10. Conclusion and Future Research. Suggest the author(s) should change Section 6.4. Conclusion and Future Research”.

Response11: we appreciate all these comments. However, we believe that the current sequence that we followed give a clear flow of the contents of each title (or sub-title). Further, the current sequence is adopted from well-established research in a high-quality Journals.