

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_108533
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Strategies in Business Area Courses at UNIFAAT University Centre, Atibaia, São Paulo, Brasil
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the role of HEIs in sustainability and achievement of SDGs is an important area of research especially for courses related to the environment</p> <p>The title could be reworded. It could be construed as referring to the sustainability of Business Area Courses at UNIFAAT University Centre</p> <p>Yes, but the results and conclusions do not appear to be reflected in the article</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Possibly, but not all intended data is presented and analysed</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Use of graphics and visual displays are appealing and help inform the reader</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not quite. There are some spelling errors. Also, some words are capitalised incorrectly. Footnotes should be identified appropriately.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is informative and generally well-written. However, it lacks a clear focus. Is the focus on sustainability or the SDGs? If it is the former, a discussion would be useful on the issue of "sustainability". The Brundtland Commission definition has its drawbacks/deficiencies and critics, which should be acknowledged. If it is the latter, which SDGs specifically inform the research and why?</p> <p>There are a range of methodological issues which need to be addressed e.g. the research is quantitative, not qualitative. The actual research question(s) being addressed should be clearly stated. Why were these research methods selected? What are the advantages and disadvantages of such methods? What was the method of sampling survey respondents? Was this a representative sample? Where and when were the questionnaires self-administered? What were the partial response and non-response rates? How were survey data analysed? Data should be disaggregated by gender and course and differences discussed.</p> <p>What does bibliographical research mean? What documentary research was used to address the research question(s), other than for description purposes of UNIFAAT?</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nick Waterman
Department, University & Country	UK