

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122720
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Transparency and Accountability in Public Service through Open Data Initiatives: Insights from Estonia and Policy Recommendations for the United States
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The most interesting part of this manuscript and important are the insights that we can learn from Estonias experiences in their implementation of the 'Open Data Initiative" among others which alongside with Finland and Denmark sustained their efforts of e-government practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The data presented herein cannot be associate with a 'policy recommendation for US' since there were limited evidences and data on US open data practices to associate/compare it with Estonia's. Suggested title: "Transparency and Accountability in Public Service: Insights from Estonia's Open Data Initiative"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, it is comprehensive. However, there was limited supporting data and analysis suggesting that the US could benefit from the findings of this study. US data was only presented in the RRL. There was no robust data presented on the status of Open Data Initiative of the US government to compare it with Estonia's, so that the paper can argue its policy recommendation for the United States. It may be appropriate to focus only on the data herein presented (Estonia).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	To present the answers for the first objective, perhaps a thorough presentation/discussion why the multi variate regression model was used to "Examine how Estonia's open data strategies align with the International Open Data Charter and G20 Anti-Corruption Principles, focusing on methodologies and legislation." A more robust and detailed discussion maybe presented in the methods and results per objectives is suggested. It may enlighten more insights from the results/findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Geraldin B. Dela Cruz
Department, University & Country	College of Engineering and Technology, Tarlac Agricultural University, Philippines