



Paper: “Employing IT Service Management to Accelerate Digital Government Transformation in Saudi Arabia: A Vision 2030 Perspective”

Submitted: 31 August 2025

Accepted: 16 September 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Fatma Abudaqqa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n28p16

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ricardo Furfaro

Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Ricardo Furfaro	
University/Country: Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales/Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: September 2, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: September 5, 2025
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0934/25	
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: yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and self-explanatory. It is aligned with the contents of the article. Please see my comments in Item 4 regarding methodology</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>There is a reference to objectives, methodology and results in the abstract.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No grammatical errors and spelling mistakes have been identified</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>The methods are, in general, explained in a clear manner. However, there is no express indication that quantitative methodology has also been used and contribute to support the author's findings.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Presented findings are clear and no errors have been identified</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusions are clearly indicated and support the manuscript content. However, there is no indication of the author's view, as to whether or not the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is or will be in a position to successfully surpass the clearly identified challenges. There is also a lack of reference to the effects of ITService Management's medium and long-term impacts on Saudi society</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References prove to be comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): *1) Include reference to use of quantitative methodology as well, and 2) Include your personal views as to whether or not the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is or will be in a position to successfully surpass the clearly identified challenges, and 3) Indicate the effects of ITService Management's medium and long-term impacts on Saudi society.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 04/09/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/09/2025
Manuscript Title: Employing IT Service Management to Accelerate Digital Government Transformation in Saudi Arabia: A Vision 2030 Perspective	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

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.	5
<i>The title reflects the general topic of the article. No change is needed.</i>	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract attempts to cover objectives, methods, and results, but the lack of coherence in writing affects its readability.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>The manuscript contains multiple grammatical errors, spelling inconsistencies, and formatting issues. These language problems interfere with smooth reading and comprehension. Careful proofreading and, ideally, professional editing are recommended.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods section demonstrates an effort to outline the research process and provides the reader with an initial understanding of the procedures followed.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results section reflects the author's effort to present findings in a straightforward manner, and no major inconsistencies or statistical inaccuracies are detected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion section shows that the author has attempted to synthesize the study's findings and relate them back to the objectives.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>A revision to ensure comprehensiveness, relevance, and correct formatting is necessary.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):