

Review of: "The Iron Cage of Internal Efficiency: A Content Analysis of Digital Transformation Strategy Direction in Swedish Regions"

Manjula Pattnaik¹

¹ Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The authors should check for typographical mistakes very carefully. A lot of flow and grammatical errors need to be corrected throughout the paper.
2. It is unknown exactly what is different and what advantages your work has over published papers in the literature.
3. What are the target papers? The proposed work should be compared with the target papers in all cases that can be done.
4. The author could write two lines in the introduction on how their Digital Transformation Strategy systems score over other systems in their proposed work for the benefits of Swedish regions and how.
5. It is unknown which part of your method belongs to your work and which part belongs to the published works in the literature to clarify your contribution.
6. How to validate your work. The validity of the work should be done based on the recent high-quality published papers.
7. The result of the adopted method is not sufficiently discussed and not inferred properly. Results and discussion sections could have been explained a little more. Though these are the most important sections, they seem to be abridged too much.