

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

Amparo Melian Navarro¹

¹ Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The work is interesting and this is suitable for Queios magazine. However, I would like to make some considerations in order to improve the final version in the following aspects:

Abstract: The abstract is incomplete because it does not include conclusions, main findings and methodology used.

Key words: Reduce the use of keywords. There are 14. The usual number is 4 to 6. This is an excessive number. The author must synthesize and reflect the authentic and most representative keywords. Rather, it suggests that the author is not capable of choice.

Introduction. Being a bibliographic work, the references are poor. Two studies only in background that could be included in this section. A reference table that covers a period of time from 2009 to 2009 when the work is from 2023. The research is not contextualized nor is there a coherent discourse that quantifies the problem. You should add more theoretical background to support one or more of the six factors addressed in this study.

Discussion. There is really no discussion of results. The author does not take advantage of the criticism he makes in his text about some works to relate them to the research. More like two unconnected attached comments.

Conclusions. No conclusions are provided. The final result is a summary and a statement of intentions about your hypothesis but it does not contrast or reach any specific conclusion. Limitations to the study could be added in this section so that the conclusions follow the discussion.

A clear methodology section is missing.

References: The bibliography is very poor. The most recent citation is from 2016. This work should have a greater number of bibliographic references and encourage discussion about them. An update of the review is needed even more when the work is bibliographic and not empirical.