

Review of: "Analyzing the nexus between Spatial Data Infrastructure Development and e-Government"

Ana Mafalda Madureira¹

¹ University of Twente

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Ezra Chipatiso. I found your paper very interesting because it deals with a gap in the translation from what academic research has shown would be tools and infrastructure that would support more informed planning decisions, but the de facto use of this infrastructure in planning practice. I also enjoyed that you brought forward the context of a Global South country with limited possibility to heavily invest and coordinate the roll-out of this infrastructure.

I would like to suggest a few improvements to make your paper more argumentative and to make your position clearer.

In the **abstract** you write that you want to describe the SDIs and their core components to analyze their current development status. But with what purpose? Why is it useful for a country like Zimbabwe to focus on improving its SDIs? Also, what do you want to uncover with the description?

The aim in the abstract (describe, analyse) does not easily lead to the one societal aim described in the **introduction** (to help raise awareness). I find that the paper as a whole does not contribute to this awareness raising because the critical question of "what for" investing in SDIs is not discussed.

You spend quite a lot of space in the paper describing SDIs in general and very few space on the e-governmental portal description and the discussion of why it is important to engage in the development of this type of SDI. My suggestion is to shorten **section 2** (maybe you can place this information in a table or a figure where the main components of a SDI are briefly presented?) and then you would have a bit more space to describe the current status of the SDI in Zimbabwe. I would also not call **section 3** an assessment, because in the end you are describing current development, but not assessing these developments against any standards.

Section 4 should be further developed. Again I don't think it is an assessment, but a discussion about the role that this e-government infrastructure can have in shaping (giving the push for?) the development of SDIs in the country. You could borrow from the potential table in section 2 to make the case that this e-governmental portal has indeed certain characteristics of an SDI but that others are missing. Therefore (recommendations) so that this webportal can be used in a more efficient and way by citizens and government. In the **conclusions** it will then be easier to return to the main purpose of the paper. What did you find?

I think the main components of the paper and discussion are there. My suggestions are meant to bring out the paper as a more critical discussion and less of a descriptive paper. Hope they help!

