

Paper: “Enhancing E-Government Proactive Services Through Advanced Data Processing Technologies”

Submitted: 20 March 2024

Accepted: 23 December 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Jose Herrera

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p28](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p28)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Priyantha W. Mudalige
University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr Priyantha W Mudalige	
University/Country: Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 Sept 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/10/2024
Manuscript Title: Enhancing E-Government Proactive Services Through Advanced Data Processing Technologies	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1016/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>Not mentioning the place or country relevant to your case is a big shortcoming.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	1
<i>Indeed, your abstract is terribly inadequate. So, I'll give you some suggestions. An abstract should include the following. Introduction to the research, study background, problem of the research, objectives of the research, methodology of the research, limitations of the research, and findings. Finally, if possible, add policy recommendations.</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
There were many grammatical errors. If you can pay close attention to it, you can protect the academic value of your article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
Not really. Therefore, I would like to respectfully recommend that you present the research methods more clearly.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
Your results are not presented clearly. And even the results presented are not enough.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
The conclusion is not entirely clear. The author has not expressed his opinion objectively.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There are major flaws in the reference list. Please use APA style. This author appears to be unfamiliar with the fundamentals of compiling a reference list for a scientific essay.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author,

I offered remarks in the hopes of producing a better completed product. You do not have to be concerned about this. I understand that you have the capability. All you must do now is submit your article in response to these remarks. follow these guidelines.

Please take care to explain the ideas using tables, graphs, and diagrams.

In many places of your article, the citations are not mentioned, which is a big shortcoming.

Do not use bulleted paragraphs in your article.

I don't see your article as a research paper. It is like a note that is distributed to the students.

You are quite poor in that regard.

Thank You

Best,

Dr. Priyantha W. Mudalige,
Senior Lecturer,
Department of Political Science,
University of Kelaniya, Kelaniya,
Sri Lanka

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the article is appropriate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear. The article provides an overview of the use of big data to increase services created to improve relations with citizens in public administration.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

In the paper Proactive model proposal is represented. (Figure 3 and page 341-342)

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequately reflects the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract effectively communicates the paper's focus on enhancing e-government services through innovative technologies.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The clarity of this paper can be improved by refining sentence structure and correcting minor grammatical errors. Authors are required to pay attention to punctuation and reducing redundancy.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology outlined for enhancing proactive e-services is well-structured and clearly defined. However, it would benefit from more detailed explanations of the data collection processes and the specific analytical techniques employed.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

no comments.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The results provide insightful evidence of the potential benefits of implementing proactive e-services through advanced data technologies. The conclusions effectively summarize the key findings and emphasize the importance of ethical considerations.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Some of the references are outdated. Authors should rely on the most recent references to establish a fair link to literature.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
