

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	Review 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.	I like this paper as it can highlight the needs and how impactful of Open Data towards the transparency. However, the author did not provide any current state of Open Data in United States as a background. There should be a comparison between the background of Estonia and United States before the author want to propose. The component to compare must be clear.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is not suitable. I suggest the article's title changed to 'The state of Open Data initiatives from the perspectives of Estonia' because in this paper, there is no measurement/analysis on the United States context.	
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.	I would suggest an addition on the background of the United States from the context of Open Data to grasp the idea on what the paper is all about and to strengthen on why United States requires that. There must be a clear problem statement.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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.	I would recommend you to change the title to reflect the content of the paper as it doesn't describe any analysis/measurement of United States. Before the author wants to propose, the background of the country the author wants to propose must be clear and suitable to compare with in terms of the populations and so forth. Besides, the abstract need to rework. An abstract should at least have a clear problem statement, objectives, method, expected output and the significance of output.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Sufficient	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
Optional/General comments	I would recommend this paper to be accepted with changes as mentioned above. Please add the attributes of united states and Estonia - similarity and the differences in the paper (in the context of what you want to measures) and only then you propose. The reason why is because you need to know the background of the subjects before you propose.	

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:	Siti Nur'asyiqin Binti Ismael
Department, University & Country	Malaysia