

14th European Conference on eGovernment

Brasov, Romania - 12-13 June 2014

Double-Blind Review Form

Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. We are keen to ensure a high standard of papers for this conference and the paper that is being sent to you has been submitted after a first selection process based on this author/s abstract. We are eager to help authors who may not yet have achieved a suitable skill in writing academic papers to the necessary quality. To this end we would be grateful if you would, wherever possible, provide constructive advice as to how they can make the paper more acceptable for presentation at a quality academic conference.

Please complete the table below and rate the paper on the issues described. As with all double-blind reviewing any comments you make will be passed to the authors on an anonymous basis.

We try to give feedback to authors within 2 weeks. Please try to complete the review within that time.

Reviewer reference	EG-025	Review Due Date	23 January 2014
Paper Title	E-participation service in Saudi Arabian E- government Websites - The influencing factors from citizens' perspective		
Conference Track	Main Conference	Submission Type	PhD research paper

To check the relevance of the paper you may like to consult the call for papers which you can find here:

<http://academic-conferences.org/eceg/eceg2014/eceg14-call-papers.htm>

Which category or categories best describes this paper:

Empirical research	
Theoretical paper that advances/challenges/adapts current theory	XX
Theoretical paper reviewing and/or synthesising current theory	
Other - please specify	

	Please rate the following: (5 excellent, 1 poor)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1	Relevance to the themes of this conference	X					
2	Contribution to academic debate	X					
3	Structure of the paper	X					
4	Standard of English –indicate below if you think the paper needs proof-reading		X				
5	Appropriateness of the research/study method			X			
6	Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables						X
7	Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper	X					
8	Appropriateness and number of keywords/key phrases			X			
9	Discussion and conclusions	X					
10	Reference list, adequate and correctly cited		X				

Taking into consideration the type of submission and the track the paper has been submitted to (see above), please give an overall rating out of 10 for this paper in terms of its contribution to this conference.	9
---	----------

Specific reviewer comments to be passed to the author/s. <i>Please expand on any weak areas in the checklist and offer specific advice as to how the author(s) may improve the paper.</i>
This paper is a well-written academic piece of work. As a PhD paper, presenting it as a 'kite-flying' exercise to a conference is a good opportunity for the paper, and a good use of the conference. Debateable points are: (1) the use of the term 'attitude' is not convincing. Its introduction and definition have inadequate critical thinking to support the proposed operational use. To many writers, an attitude is a propensity to behave – rather different from the operation definition adopted; (2) the methodology is not convincing for a topic that is not yet well understood – it is an ideal candidate for a first qualitative phase to explore concepts and form good questions; (3) Survey Monkey? Choice of respondents? – these need considerable more refinement to be credible.

Can this paper be accepted for presentation at the conference?

Yes - no changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes - with minor revisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - with major revisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

Thank you for your help.

Please return this form to carol@academic-conferences.org

