
**Review**

As we enter the second decade of the new millennium, the paper by Mazaheri et al. (2020) provides a timely update on the state of information systems research over the last decade. Using a systematic review approach, Mazaheri and colleagues considered the assortments and trajectories of topics and methodologies of information systems research published in the top basket of information systems journals selected by the Association for Information Systems—namely:

- *European Journal of Information Systems*
- *Information Systems Journal*
- *Information Systems Research*
- *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*
- *Journal of Information Technology*
- *Journal of Management Information Systems*
- *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*
- *MIS Quarterly*

The results from the systematic review suggest that electronic business and commerce, general information systems research, and information systems adoption and usage were the top three topics and that survey, mathematical modelling, and case study were the top three methodologies for information systems research in the top basket of information systems journals.

Notwithstanding the rich insights shed on the state of information systems research in the top basket of information systems journals over the last decade, Mazaheri and colleagues have rightly acknowledged the limitation of their systematic review in understating the interest and importance of emerging topical trends, such as blockchain, fintech, internet of things, and sharing economy. This is unsurprising given that scholarly interest on these topics have only proliferated recently and that scholarly publishing is often a lengthy, rigorous process. In this regard, this limitation is appropriate and acceptable.

Nevertheless, the promise of systematic reviews was not fully delivered in that paper. In particular, the goal of systematic reviews is to deliver a replicable and meticulous summary of specific sources of information that informs and shapes future research agenda (Paul et al., 2019)—the former (or the summary) was richly conveyed, but the latter (or the research agenda) was underdeveloped by Mazaheri et al. (2020). The duality in the goal of systematic reviews should therefore be considered by information systems scholars interested to conduct systematic reviews, whereby a significant portion of the paper should be dedicated for developing a research agenda that advances conceptual (Lim, 2018), contextual (Lim et al., 2019), and methodological (Lim & Mandrinos, 2020) understanding of information systems.
To this end, it is important to note that the *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, which is ranked “A” by the Australian Council of Professors and Heads of Information Systems (ACPHIS) and the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC), is a leading information systems journal outside the top basket that offers the opportunity for information systems scholars to participate in constructive discussion leading to the strengthening of ideas and arguments of its past papers. This exemplifies the contribution of post-publication reviews, and more importantly, the additional value that information systems journals outside the top basket can contribute to enhancing theory and practice in the discipline of information systems.
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