

# Review of: "Inspiring a Culture of Appreciation of High-Performing Faculty Members and Research Scholars"

Justice Djokoto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dominion University College

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The introduction, whilst adequate in providing the background of the study, failed to present the problem definition.

The gap in the literature that the author hoped to plug has not been identified.

Surprisingly, no literature is cited in the introduction.

The literature survey focused on the empirical literature. The theoretical underpinings are missing. These should be provided.

I noticed "problem statement" in Section 3. This is a misnomer. If the author is presenting a full-length paper, it ought to be structured as follows:

Introduction (including the background, problem statement, gap analysis, objectives and contributions to the literature and stakeholders, and then how the rest of the paper is organised).

Literature review (theoretical and empirical. The last paragraph of the section should summarise the literature gap).

Methods (data, models, estimation/analysis)

Results and discussion (The tables/charts of the analysis are presented and commented/explained here. The explanation is connected to the empirical literature).

Conclusion (this answers the problem statement and responds to the objectives. It includes the policy recommendations as well as what stakeholders should do).

I saw a section on the Laws of the United States of America. I wonder about the purpose of this section in an Indian paper.

The title, introduction, and the literature are inconsistent. The focus of the title appears to be on the recognition of faculty. But the introduction and literature are focused on suicide of students connected to discrimination from faculty/guides.

The paper needs to be restructured, and the contents realigned and rewritten to reflect the title.

