

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

Ruhul Fitrios¹

¹ Universitas Riau

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article, and I have a few notes:

Title and introduction

For me, this article is very interesting, because there are new ideas presented. You collect the results of previous research/research.

But after I read it, I think the title "management" is too broad, compared to the content of the article which examines more about "planning". The introduction should emphasize the importance of ICT management for organizational success.

Literature Review

Based on the title, in the literature review the researcher should explain the concepts of "management", "ICT management", "sustainability" and "success", not studying ICT, but emphasizing ICT management.

2) The content of the literature review contradicts the title "management", while the content of the literature review is the opposite, ICT plays the role of manager, even though it should explain ICT management.

3) Based on this description, I think the literature review is weak. It would be better if you studied point 1.

methodology

The research method is unclear.

What research methodology was used in this study? What type of study approach was used? What testing tools are used to test the efficiency of ICT resource management, if using testing tools, and how to test them?

Apart from that, there is repetition of the research objective sentence!

It seems that this methodology needs to be explained in a more structured way.

discussion

Based on this management concept, researchers detail ICT management in a structured manner in discussion points

The discussion in the discussion section seems very simple, not supported by many previous research results.

Meanwhile, this research comes from and is supported by many previous research results.

conclusion

Make sure the conclusions are obtained from previous discussions and are not secondary discussions.

What does this research recommend?