

Review of: "Developing and Supporting High-Performing Faculty Teams in Engineering Institutions"

Fátima Monteiro¹

¹ Instituto Superior de Engenharia de Coimbra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Congratulations on choosing the topic, as the topic of the paper is very important and interesting: corruption in academia in India. However, the paper needs significant changes. Here are some suggestions to help improve the article:

- The title is not appropriate to the content of the article, as the article only defines a list of indications / suggestions on measures to be implemented
- The introduction is too short and does not substantiate or support the defined objectives; no references either.
- In several parts of the text, innovation is referred to without being linked to the problem of corruption, nor is any reason mentioned for being mentioned / included in the study
- The article does not explain the reason for the defined objectives: there should be a better articulation and foundation between the introduction (which should be expanded) and the objectives.
- The objectives do not clearly correspond to the results shown. The paper does not show the relationship between the methodology and the objectives.
- The point "3. Literature Survey" is not explicitly related to the objectives, nor to the methodology. References to documents from the USA seem inappropriate to me (documents from the country of study should be referred to) and the issue of inclusion and non-discrimination was not framed before and in the paper is not related to corruption (which is supposedly the central theme of the paper).
- From point 3.2 to 3.4 (including table 1) phrases and statements extracted from other documents are presented, without complying with the citation rules, which constitutes plagiarism. Quotation marks should be used and the respective reference must be provided. It seems to me that the part of the paper that are citations (albeit without quotes) is too large.
- The presence of Table 1 is not perceived because the objectives do not refer to literature research, nor is this mentioned in the methodology.
- Perhaps point 3 is a bibliographical research to frame the subject of the study, and if so, it should be part of the introduction and not after the methodology.
- In point 4, the survey questions should be presented and the type of question mentioned (open?, closed?...).
- Data analysis should not be limited to a list of points, but be more explained. In the conclusions, it should be explained how the study helps in the fight against corruption in the academic environment.
- References need to be revised as a consistent method is not used throughout the text (APA or IEEE?). There are also almost no references throughout the text, but there is a large list of references at the end, which is not good.

Good luck in improving the paper.