Dear reviewer,

Thank you for volunteering to serve as a reviewer for the Advances in Management Information Systems (AMIS) volume on electronic government. AMIS is a series of research monographs devoted to the principal aspects of information systems with Dr. Vladimir Zwass as the series editor. AMIS is intended to become a lasting record of both the knowledge about organizational information systems and of research methods for creating new knowledge. For more information about the AMIS monograph series, please visit http://www.mesharpe.com/amis.htm. For further information about the volume on electronic government, please visit http://faculty.washington.edu/jscholl/CfP_AMIS_e_Gov.html.

The review form consists of eight questions total. There are four long-response questions that ask you to summarize the main points of the paper, describe the strongest and weakest points, and offer suggestions for improvements. These questions are followed by four short, scaled-response questions where you are asked to assess the paper on various qualities; indicate the overall suitability of the paper for the AMIS volume; assess your own expertise in the field represented by the paper; and assess your level of confidence in your own review. We aim to produce a volume that represents the same high level of quality embodied in past AMIS volumes, and as such, we ask that you take the time to conduct this review with the same rigor and thoroughness that would be applied to an academic journal.

Reviews should be returned no later than June 17th, 2008. You may submit your review using the online survey or by emailing a Word or PDF copy of this completed form to the review coordinator at amisegov@u.washington.edu. Any questions or concerns may also be directed to this address.

Thanks for your participation!

-AMIS editorial team
For the first four questions, please provide detailed responses in narrative form, remembering to include justifications for your assessments. There is no limit to the length of the responses.

**Question 1**
Summary: Please describe main points of the paper.

**Question 2**
Strengths: Please describe the strongest points of the paper.
Question 3
Weaknesses: Please describe the weakest points of the paper.

Question 4
Improvements: Please offer suggestions for improving the paper.
Question 5
Please rate the paper on the following qualities on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the study domain of e-Government and e-Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest to reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (organization, completeness, clarity, quality of writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6
Please indicate your overall assessment of this paper.

- [ ] Accept: paper is acceptable in its current state
- [ ] Accept with minor changes: content and presentation meet professional standards but could use minor improvements
- [ ] Accept with major changes: content of the paper has merit, but presentation (organization, clarity, completeness, and quality of writing) should be improved
- [ ] Probable reject: paper has fundamental flaws in content or presentation, or is very poorly written
- [ ] Reject: content is inappropriate for the project or has little merit

Question 7
Reviewer Self-Assessment: Please rate your level of expertise in the field represented by this paper.

- [ ] Expert
- [ ] High
- [ ] Medium
- [ ] Low
- [ ] Null

Question 8
Reviewer Self-Assessment: Please rate your level of confidence in this review.

- [ ] Expert
- [ ] High
- [ ] Medium
- [ ] Low
- [ ] Null