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

José Armando Valente[1]

1 Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The objective of the article is to propose a new conceptual framework for the concept of e-Government. The theme is important and relevant. However, the article presents some weak points that should be observed. First, the title does not match the objective and the development of the article. The article is not about a review of the literature, but a proposal of a new conceptual framework for e-Government. Second, the abstract does not indicate the method used to produce the article. Third, the keywords are too many and most of the words are part of the conceptual framework described in the abstract. Fourth, the article does not make explicit the method used for the literature review. It is not clear what was the criteria for selecting the articles that are discussed. Fifth, the "Purpose of the Study" section correctly mentions that "Since e-Government cannot be defined in a vacuum, guiding frameworks on how to formulate a comprehensive definition of the program are necessary." However, the "Proposed Conceptual Framework for E-Government" section adopts an approach that is quite arbitrary by selecting six concepts such as ICT platforms, processes, information and service delivery, digital society and businesses, public participation and involvement, and accountability and transparency. As presented, the concepts are "defined in a vacuum" contradicting the article's purpose. Certainly, each of them is discussed and explained in terms of its meaning. The problem is that the only concept that is justified in relation to other e-Government definition is ICT. How are the other concepts justified in relation to other definitions or works? Sixth, the discussion section needs to be more elaborated. It simply reinforces the selection of the six framework concepts without discussing how this framework differs from or is similar to other works. Finally, the article is very repetitive since the six framework concepts are mentioned in most of the article sections. Thus, the article needs major revisions.