Review of: "[Review] Redefining the Concept of e-Government Program. A Review of the Literature"

Md. Fouad Hossain Sarker[1]

1 Daffodil International University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Article Title: Redefining the Concept of e-Government Program. A Review of the Literature

Firstly, I extend my congratulations to the author for their thoughtful and timely contribution, particularly in their efforts to redefine the e-government program by building upon existing definitions and information. Undoubtedly, this work significantly enhances comprehension of e-government programs from a distinct perspective. There exist some observations that enhance the attractiveness and readability of this esteemed scholarly effort:

1. **Abstract**: In order to compose a scientific and methodical abstract, several aspects must be considered. These include providing a general overview of the topic, clearly stating the objective of the study, outlining the methodology followed, summarizing the important findings, and discussing potential future directions and areas for additional investigation. The author fails to acknowledge the methodology employed in the study or the specific databases utilized. In order to establish the credibility of the research, it is imperative to provide a clear definition of the review article. Furthermore, the absence of any prospective trajectory that engenders reader interest is evident in this text.

2. **Keywords**: In the context of scientific study, it is advisable to limit the number of keywords considered to a range of five to seven, as opposed to the first suggestion of fourteen.

3. **Background**: I recommend that the author integrate the background section into the introduction, and augment the rational justifications by drawing upon existing literature. Merely presenting the outcomes of two studies is insufficient to establish the significance of the research. It is essential to commence by examining the inception of e-government and the varying definitions provided by scholars.

4. **Introduction:** The introduction section of the research paper should encompass many key components. Firstly, it should provide a comprehensive history that contextualizes the topic under investigation. This background should be followed by a clear and concise problem statement, which outlines the specific issue that the study aims to solve. Additionally, the introduction should emphasize the significance and rationale behind conducting the study, highlighting its relevance within the broader academic and practical contexts. Lastly, the introduction should conclude with a specific study objective, which outlines the intended outcome or purpose of the research. In this recommendation, it is suggested that the author should consider organizing the components of their research paper in a specific manner. Specifically, it is proposed that the problem statement be presented in the second phase, following the background information. Subsequently, the importance and motivation of the study should be addressed, and ultimately, the

objectives of the research should be outlined. Authors should systematically arrange their work according to the existing body of literature, while also ensuring the logical consistency and cohesion of these components.

5. **Objectives and the Problem Statement**: Be included in the introduction section.

6. **Literature Review:** The author is advised to conduct a comprehensive literature review that aligns with the study objectives, as the current literature review lacks a clear connection to the title. This section lacks adequacy and fails to incorporate the most recent research findings. The majority of the studies referenced in the article span from 2002 to 2011. The presence of unanswered questions within the text may lead to reader confusion and potentially diminish the overall acceptance of the work. The current year is 2023, however, the author of Table 1 has only referenced research findings from the years 2002 to 2009. Furthermore, I recommend that the author develop a conceptual framework immediately following the final paragraph of the literature review, based on current literature studies. The author's consideration of the six domains in this section, however, demonstrates their inherent shortcomings. Without any preceding empirical investigations, the conversation included four major topics out of six (government processes, information, and service delivery; digital society, enterprises, and other governments; and accountability and openness). An explanation of how the author constructed the conceptual framework without prior research is essential.

7. **Study Design and Methods**: Completely ignored by the author.

8. **Discussion:** The author's writing for the discussion part was lacking in originality. Further elaboration is required by incorporating existing empirical research. In this instance, *the author has stated that the concept of e-government is subject to substantial misinterpretation among scholars and practitioners, as evidenced by the literature*. However, it is worth noting that the author did not explicitly address these individuals in the subsequent discussion section. In contrast, the author has identified six specific domains that have been utilized to redefine the notion, necessitating more elucidation through previous scholarly investigations.

9. **Limitations and Implication:** Be included in the conclusion section.

10. **Conclusion**: It should be placed on the immediately following discussion. A systematic and systemic conclusion summarizes the findings in relation to the research objectives, hypothesis, and research questions. The author merely describes the model that is proposed based on the objective in this section, but it does not show how the conclusion was produced. As a result, I recommend rewriting this section to include study limitations and consequences.

Final Comments: Finally, the term "e-government" was mentioned throughout the paper, specifically in relation to the redefinition of e-government. However, it is worth noting that the title of the study refers to the e-government program. The presence of errors within the text may lead to the emergence of inquiries among the readers, thus it is advisable to rectify them.

The author, on the other hand, completely disregards the methodological portion, such as What was the method? For this review, what data source or set did the author use? How did the author code the data or create the theme (six) before building the conceptual framework? What analysis tools were used to uncover the findings, and so on? In the lack of a scientific approach, how can the findings be accepted by the audience? To increase the value of this study, I propose addressing all of these points along with the entire structure of the paper and avoiding repetitiveness.