DRUID

Review paper

69987 Insights into Cloud Computing Outsourcing Relationships: A Systematic Literature Review from an Agency Theory Perspective

☑ **I confirm that I have no personal interest in the outcome of the assessment of this paper and that my grading was carried out impartially and carefully in accordance with the detailed instructions**

Submit paper grade

Please keep in mind that DRUID is a conference aiming to stimulate debate and diversity as well as strengthen the quality of research. The conference invites high-quality research from any social science discipline addressing innovation and change. Hence, **it is NOT the aim of the conference to present polished, submission-ready research or research with a very narrow, disciplinary stance.** In addition to presenting 'normal science', we give high priority to papers with ideas with potentially high impact, new approaches and creative methods.

You can find the Call for Papers for DRUID23 here: DRUID23

Generally, when grading, generally think of selecting papers you would like to find in conference sessions you attend. Keep in mind that you are assessing novel work in progress and NOT final papers submitted to a journal.

Papers awarded the grade 4 (= Definitely be included) should be relevant, and both novel and high quality. Irrelevant papers should be graded 1 (= Definitely not be included). Papers that are technically accomplished but with no novel ideas or implications, or novel but with sloppy methods, should not be graded higher than 3 (= Probably be included).

Relevance

DRUID does not present specialized natural sciences/engineering papers, or papers that do not fall into the field of Industrial Dynamics in a broad sense by addressing innovation and the dynamics of structural, institutional or geographic change.

Novelty

Examples of novelty include, for instance:
- The paper can make a significant empirical and/or theoretical contribution to the existing literature
- The paper develops or introduces methods previously unknown or uncommon within the field of Industrial Dynamics
- The paper improves significantly the range or sophistication of methods already used or having broad applicability within the field of Industrial Dynamics
- The paper introduces novel data or new data sources that may open up for entirely new lines of interesting research

Quality

While we emphasize the novelty of a paper, if a paper does not live up to the usual quality criteria, i.e. with clearly stated aims, research questions, with clear theoretical positioning, relevant and well-accounted-for empirical method, argumentation and writing, it will detract from its other merits.

- ○ **4) Definitely include in the conference program**
- ◉ **3) Probably include (if space permits)**
- ○ **2) Probably not include**
- ○ **1) Definitely not include**

Candidate for best paper

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

Comments to the organizers about this paper. NO summary of content, please.

Thank you very much for having the opportunity to review your paper. This is truly impressive work and a highly timely topic. Cloud computing is highly relevant, and I can see it experiencing an advent right now due to the increasing use of artificial intelligence applications.

The perspective applied in this paper related to the cloud topic is through a lens or focus on outsourcing and agency. I think outsourcing is highly relevant, particularly in the context of big tech companies having much access and market shares within the cloud computing market, even more so.

The number of sorted papers is quite impressive. However, I am not quite sure whether I understand whether a large number of papers that focus on a cloud from a service perspective have been excluded. Maybe this reason is obvious (I assume so), but I suggest including a footnote or mentioning at least a short explanation of why the service perspective is irrelevant.

In addition, I think the number of references is quite lower than the mentioned 300 plus references. I think it would be good to briefly explain in which ways the other papers have been utilized throughout the analysis.

From the selection of the papers for review, the authors almost instantly jump into the synthesis of the review based on chapters 3.1, 3.2, and so on. I think here I would have appreciated some more insights on how the review has been conducted. In addition, the small tables provided can feel a bit constructed rather than adequately described and illustrated.

This said, sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 are well-written, and the authors can clearly seem to know and understand the literature. However, I am not quite sure whether all the topics are relevant or are directly necessary concerning both the topics of outsourcing and, in particular, the focus on the agency perspective. It seems to be a bit broad, which is fine, but then it would be important to state what are similar perspectives on the same level of relevance as outsourcing and an agency perspective.

The table on page 20 is excellent and very informative. As a way to further improve it, it could be beneficial to add the papers related to each section and insight possibly. Alternatively, provide the table before this one (before the higher-order synthesis).

I think this work has great potential. Overall, I suggest linking better the different analysis topics and insights to the “big” outcome table currently labeled as “Table 1”. In addition, I think the number of papers is still quite high for a literature review. I can see that a systematic literature review aims to be comprehensive and therefore including all found literature makes sense. However, I could see the option of further narrowing down the literature, for example, in terms of fields, journals, dates, etc... That would allow giving all the papers the necessary space and analysis, including mentioning it in the paper.

I congratulate the authors of this work, and I wish them all the best for further development.

Submit

DRUID HOME

CONTACT

druid@druid.dk

SOCIAL