

Manuscript: **“Healthcare Organizations and Enterprise Architecture: A Case Study in Canada”**

Submitted: 26 November 2020

Accepted: 05 March 2021

Published: 31 March 2021

Corresponding Author: Onyeka Uche Ofili

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n8p33

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luca Scaini, Al Akhawayn University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Nishant Agrawal, Nirma University, India

Reviewer 3: Alicia Guadalupe Valdez Menchaca, Universidad Autonoma de Coahuila, Mexico

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes, very clear and direct

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Almost: it is clear only I would suggest to mention in a clearer way the methodology adopted. The author is trying to measure the perception, but it is not even mentioned how.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

no

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The literature review is a bit unusual, basically it is not not a review at all, it is a structures list of references, basically a structured or architected bibliography. To be considered a review, the author should have explained why and how the principal references ar adopted. This kind of scheme is useful to understand the system of hypothesis. it must be redone.

The explanation of mixed methodology at pg. 9 is correct, but not very useful: why the author has adopted this system in regard of his or her goals? What has exactly quantitatively measured?

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes, very well done. I would only explain much much better who is the tested sample (it is widely called "the stakeho0lders", but till the end it is not fully clear. It wopuld help the describe the sample at the begionning of the body or methodology and why.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes well done

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear authors, amazing work, but I would suggest to review the literature review that is not a literature review at all but a structured bibliography; moreover the sample must be identified, described and motivated much much better. Who is the sample? Why have been chosen? why is it representative of the population? Last, why have you considered important a mixed q-q methodology in this study?

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Do not use word Enterprise Architecture (EA) and Information Technology (IT) again and again. It is better to use EA and IT.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Draw steps mentioned in RM instead of an image. Is this Qualitative or Quantitative? Because in abstract Qualitative method is mentioned.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Formating is very poor and adds more latest literature to improve the paper. An introduction should be motivated to reader and also mentioned research gaps.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Improve the representation of this section. This looks very weak and also discuss in detail.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

No. Add more literature from 2017 to 2020. Follow journal guidelines. Formating is very poor.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

I believe that the title is correct with the research carried out.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The authors could mention about the enterprise architecture tool where they stored the collected data.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

No.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the authors could explain some of the more current methodologies used to analyze and implement enterprise architecture.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

No.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research is very well done and provides a lot of knowledge on the subject of enterprise architecture, which is not yet fully implemented by companies.