

Paper: “The Public Value of E-government: A Qualitative Study from the Perspective of Private-Sector Professionals in Morocco”

Submitted: 18 November 2023

Accepted: 29 December 2024

Published: 31 January 2024

Corresponding Author: Chaimaa Idaomar

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n1p32

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title accurately reflects the content of the paper and clearly conveys the main topic of the article, which is the public value of e-government from the perspective of private-sector professionals in Morocco.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract provides a clear overview of the paper's objectives, methods, and results. It briefly summarizes the key points of the paper and effectively conveys the importance of the research.

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

Based on the provided text, there are no apparent grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. The paper appears to be clear and well-edited, demonstrating attention to detail in terms of grammar and spelling.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The article mixes the results of primary and secondary research. This is a problem. The methodology is short and not clear and little is known about the circumstances of the research (e.g. selection of sample, questions of interview, etc).

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

The biggest problem is the poor quality of the secondary review. In its absence, we have little information about the relevance of the research and the results of other researchers. There is no real literature review, just a list of literature. It does not provide any relevant information about e-government, its value, etc. Actually, we only know who dealt with this topic but we don't really know what the main findings are.

The results of qualitative research (interview) should never be processed using quantitative methods of analysis. There is no point in percentage analysis, the total sample is just 13 companies. This is a qualitative research, not a quantitative.

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

The conclusions are well-supported by the content of the paper and effectively summarize the key findings.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

See above: There is no real literature review, just a list of literature. The list looks impressive, but this is not the reality. There is no real literature review behind it.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Do a real literature review and delete the percentages. "none of it makes sense"

Reviewer I:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title of the paper should emphasize the type of the employed analysis.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract should reveal the policy and practical implications of the research.

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

The paper is generally free of English mistakes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The research methods are properly explained.

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

The whole text of the paper is accurate.

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

The concluding remarks are in line with the whole content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are suitable, but an extension is necessary.

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]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The submission entitled “The Public Value of e-Government from the Perspective of Private-Sector Professionals in Morocco” aims to explore the public value of e-government in Morocco, using Delone and Mclean's (2016) Information Systems (IS) success model as a reference framework. Overall, the paper approaches a worth exploring topic showing a proper structure and suitable documentation. However, the following revisions should be implemented:

- the introductory section should reveal the novelty and originality of the study;
- the outcomes' discussion should be expanded;
- a distinct section dedicated to final remarks should be developed. At the same time, the practical and policy implications should be formulated.
