

# Review of: "Efficient Management of Information Communication Technology Resources in an Organisation"

Enoch Adusei

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Abstract

Authors may highlight their research approach, and also make recommendations for future research trajectory.

## Introduction

Authors stated with practical implications which should actually be part of the concluding paragraphs of the introduction, thus, I suggest authors may want to start the introduction by giving a brief background of the study, establishing the current trends in the field, what others have generally perceived and evident in literature relating to their topic, and the motivation for conducting such a study. I believe this may keep readers on the suspense and engage readers to make the introduction more interesting and worth reading.

Authors may clearly elucidate their research gap to justify the relevance and contribution of their study.

Authors may provide expected contributions of their study to the extant literature and managerial research.

The concluding part of the introduction must outline the remaining sections of the presentation.

## Related Works

I believe this section should be expanded to "Related Works and Research Gap". This is because the presentation for related studies must help identify research gaps which leads to research questions and road mapping.

Authors listed some related studies without feeding readers with the relevance of these studies to the current study. Perhaps, authors failed to relate these studies to the current study.

Authors may try and improve upon the current state of the literature review.

## Methodology

Which databases were employed? and why do authors perceive such databases were appropriate enough to provide information for the study?

Authors may clarify their research approach, if it is a systematic review, then authors must provide clear systematic strategy they employed to identify and source information for the study.

Other parts of the work, and discussion

I believe authors must provide readers with how they processed the final 49 articles leading to the discussions and findings. At the moment, authors have not clearly briefed readers on how they utilized the sourced data in providing the presented outcomes and findings.