

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

Attila Simo¹

¹ Polytechnic University of Timisoara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic addressed by the authors, in the current context of digitization, is a topical one. Efficiency is talked about in all fields, and management acquires increasingly important values in this context.

The authors' approach is an interesting one. The ideas presented are valuable. The way things are presented is well structured. The methodology is also properly presented. The results are to be taken into account by any organization that intends to improve the approach in this field. The results support the conclusions formulated by the authors.

However, for this work to gain the desired value, in my opinion, certain improvements must be made:

1. The abstract should be rewritten. It should contain answers to the following questions: What problem was studied and why is it important? What methods were used? What are the important results? What conclusions can be drawn from the results? What is the novelty of the work and where does it go beyond previous efforts in the literature?
2. The Introduction should make a compelling case for why the study is useful along with a clear statement of its novelty or originality by providing relevant information and providing answers to basic questions such as: What is already known in the open literature? What is missing (i.e., research gaps)? What needs to be done, why, and how? Clear statements of the novelty of the work should also appear briefly in the Abstract and Conclusions sections.
3. The Related Works Section could be greatly improved. The authors first need to make comparisons of the related work and then draw the motivation of the paper. Neither the comparison of references and this work nor the corresponding conclusion is made in the paper. Thus, it is difficult for me to know the novelty and advantages of this paper over other works.
4. From the list of references, about 36% of the papers analyzed are from the last 3 years. Too little, in my opinion. The list needs to be improved, considerably. This aspect will bring improvements and meet the requirements from the previous points.