Manuscript: "**An e-Delphi Study on Software Virtualization in the Medical Diagnosis Process: The Experts' Perspective**"

Corresponding Author: Dr. Byrian L. Ramsey

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Terrence Duncan,
USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Terrence Duncan	Email: drterrenceduncan@gmail.com
University/Country: USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/15/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/21/20
Manuscript Title: **An e-Delphi Study on Software Virtualization in the Medical Diagnosis Process: The Experts' Perspective**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0990/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes** You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **The title is consistent within the scope of the study**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	

(Please insert your comments) **Yes, the author identified the type of study conducted and findings of his qualitative study**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
(Please insert your comments) **The study could benefit from a Grammar review. There were some minor editing errors found, but nothing to distract from the entire presentation.**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The author did an exceptional job detailing the problem statement, research question, and the methodology. The data collection process was well articulated.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
Minor editing, grammatical errors noted. Some areas could benefit from having citations, particularly in the problem statement.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
The conclusion and presentation of the findings were aligned with the scope of research and presentation of the research.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
References are acceptable and relative to the scope of study.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

> Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

Please see attached.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Please see attached

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
No additional comments necessary. This was an enjoyable read