









PEER REVIEW REPORT OF THE MANUSCRIPT



Manuscript data:

Type of manuscript : Research article (Theoretical-empirical)

Title : Intrapreneurial intensity of a community higher education institution in Santa Catarina, Brazil

Authors : Roberta Pedrini  , Tatiana Ghedine  ,
Gustavo Behling  , and Juan Llopis  

Article ID: 2424

Manuscript's DOI : <https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2424>.

Peer review report data:

How to cite : Mendes, M. K. & Anonymous. (2025). Peer review report of the manuscript: Intrapreneurial intensity of a community higher education institution in Santa Catarina, Brazil. *REGEPE Entrepreneurship and Small Business Journal*, 14, e2424pr. <https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2424pr>.



Round ↓	Reviewers			
	1	2	3	4
1	R1R1	R1R2		
2	R2R1	R2R2	R2R3	
3				
4				

Editorial data:

Editor-in-Chief¹ or Adjunct²:

¹ Dr. Edmundo Inácio Júnior
Univ. Estadual de Campinas, UNICAMP

**Associate Editor:**

Dr. Eduardo Pinto Vilas Boas
Escola de Empreendedorismo do SEBRAE, ESE

**Executive¹ or Assistant² Editor:**

¹M. Eng. Patrícia Trindade de Araújo



ROUND 1:

1st Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2023-09-07 08:01 PM

Recommendation : Decline Submission

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

A discussão apresenta boa coesão textual. As referências utilizadas estão bem articuladas com as proposições feitas.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

O objetivo está clara e consistentemente definido. Observa-se a preocupação em informar a devida problematização..

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

O conteúdo exposto na fundamentação teórica apresenta coerência e encadeamento lógico. Contudo me parece que seria preciso que a base teórica contivesse uma discussão mais aprofundada envolvendo intraempreendedorismo e intensidade intraempreendedora, baseada nos resultados e discussões de trabalhos publicados nos últimos anos. Identificam-se apenas quatro ou cinco trabalhos, publicados desde 2018, sobre estes temas.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Pelo objetivo definido para o estudo, os procedimentos metodológicos mostram-se adequados. Contudo, para o alcance das contribuições pretendidas (conforme mencionado nas considerações finais), seria necessária uma abordagem metodológica mais ampla.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Os resultados propostos pelo objetivo são alcançados, no entanto, a discussão, a partir dos resultados, faz poucas relações com a literatura prévia.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

As conclusões mostram-se alinhadas ao objetivo proposto, entretanto se mostram muito limitadas ao contexto da organização pesquisada. Por favor, veja os comentários na sequência (general evaluation), para mais clareza sobre este comentário.

7. General Evaluation

Indicate in the space below additional suggestions to the authors to improve the article, for example, in relation to: Form (structure, language, readability) or other useful comments to the authors.

Prezadas/os Autoras/es,

Agradeço-lhes pela oportunidade de avaliar o trabalho de vocês e, em especial, pela possibilidade de poder contribuir para as suas pesquisas. Trata-se de um tema relevante aos campos de estudos do intraempreendedorismo e da gestão acadêmica.

Para a avaliação do trabalho, levei em conta, em especial e necessariamente, o contexto estrito da revista à qual a submissão foi feita. Trata-se de um periódico que se encontra empenhado em propiciar a disseminação de avanços teóricos e metodológicos nas áreas do empreendedorismo e da gestão de organizações de pequeno porte.

Nessa perspectiva, eu proponho uma reflexão sobre em que medida o estudo traz as contribuições teóricas e metodológicas ao campo de estudos do intraempreendedorismo, apontadas pelos autores.

Os autores mencionam a adaptação do instrumento à realidade e especificidades de organizações como IES como uma dessas contribuições. No entanto, ao se comparar a escala original (Hill, 2003) com o questionário traduzido e adaptado, se observa que as adaptações contextuais são restritas a poucos elementos (os principais parecem ser: managers = administração superior; in our organisation = na IES; our leaders = meu gestor imediato), sem os quais o instrumento não perderia sua validade de conteúdo.

Também, para a adaptação da escala com o propósito de propiciar a replicação dela, acredito que fosse preciso que algumas etapas do processo de adaptação transcultural fossem realizadas, por exemplo, a análise fatorial.

Pela análise destes apontamentos, e considerando que outras possíveis contribuições e implicações não são identificadas, considero que as discussões feitas no estudo não conduzem a efetivas contribuições teóricas ao campo de estudos do intraempreendedorismo.

De outro lado, o estudo apresenta como principal força, justamente, a possibilidade de contribuição prática, em especial, à organização em que a investigação foi conduzida. Como não se é possível extrapolar as discussões a partir dos achados a outras IES, uma sugestão que faço é que a análise dos dados e as discussões poderiam ser mais fortemente direcionadas à compreensão do contexto organizacional em que os dados foram coletados. Dessa forma, talvez, mais contribuições gerenciais à organização estudada poderiam ser consistentemente construídas.

Se essa linha fosse adotada, o estudo deveria, então, ganhar características do desenho de um artigo tecnológico, o que poderia contribuir para a evidência da importância do trabalho para o campo de estudos.

Desejo-lhes êxito na continuidade de suas pesquisas.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

☒ Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

☒ Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

2nd Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2023-11-01 12:17 PM
Recommendation : Resubmit for Review

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

The text is written clearly, but it needs English revision, as its presentation indicates a straightforward translation from Portuguese to English. Furthermore, there are sections that remain in Portuguese and require corrections. It is also advisable to provide an English version of the questionnaire, considering that the document was originally written in English.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

The objective of the text is clearly presented. However, I noticed a lack of a theoretical framework that links the study's objective to the identified gap in the literature. This connection is not well-established in the literature analysis. My suggestion is to address this by providing a more solid theoretical foundation.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

In this section, I found that a more structured connection was lacking. The author introduced the concept of intrapreneurship as a synonym for corporate entrepreneurship, drawing from one of the authors. However, it's important to note that the broader literature encompasses this concept, with intrapreneurship being a subset of it. Additionally, the author touched upon the concept of Community HEI, but I believe a concise yet clearer definition of this context is necessary. In the American context, for example, this term represents a different type of institution.

It's crucial to contextualize whether these Community HEIs also underwent a process of adopting new pro-market approaches, as discussed in the text, or if they had to adapt to the new scenario. This is intriguing, particularly given the strong political bias these institutions often have.

Furthermore, the author highlighted on page 4 that academic organizations are different from other types of organizations. It's essential to clarify in what specific ways they are different. Could this divergence be a potential bias affecting the final results? Are academic organizations more regulated and rigid in their operations? Please provide clarity on this.

On page 5, the author referenced Agbor (2008); however, this source did not address the concept of intrapreneurship but focused on the role of leadership in implementing strategies for organizational competitiveness. I also noticed the absence of the reference for the excerpt on page 5, which discusses the importance of fostering an intrapreneurial culture to facilitate organizational transformation and adapt to the current competitive environment.

On page 7, the author introduced several instruments for measuring intrapreneurship levels. It would be beneficial to explicitly state which instrument will be adopted and present it in a structured manner. While the author mentions figures 1, 2, and 3, they are all presented as tables. I'm uncertain whether "figure 2," which summarizes the instruments, is necessary. This table might divert attention away from the instrument that will be used. It is recommended to improve the presentation of Hill's model (2003) and concentrate on presenting the specific instrument used in the study.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

The author initiates the method section by discussing the dimensions under investigation. I suggest that this aspect be introduced in the presentation of the instrument within the preceding section. Additionally, the author mentions the limits established by Hill (2003) on page 10, but this information was not provided earlier. Once again, there is a need for a more comprehensive presentation of the instrument used.

Furthermore, a clearer characterization of the study's subject is needed. Specifically, it's essential to describe the type of institution, whether it is public or private, as this can have implications for hiring practices and subsequently impact the flexibility of the people management model.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

The text just below Table 1 on page 12 should ideally be included in the presentation of the instrument section rather than in the results section.

On page 13, the sentence "However, it is possible to identify that there is a larger number of people in the low and high indexes" is somewhat confusing. It would be helpful to clarify the implications of this observation. This phenomenon may be a reflection of respondents' tendencies not to select the extreme values on a Likert scale.

Still on page 13, the author notes that for "structural flexibility," the classification is primarily low and extremely low. This outcome could potentially reflect the organization's inherent characteristics, such as a lack of mobility. It would be beneficial to explain the nature of the positions and the selection process within this HEI. If it primarily relies on competitive or public selection, it might inherently lack flexibility. In other words, even with leadership predisposition, flexibility might not be feasible.

On page 15, in the excerpt: "However, the company they work for does not stimulate nor harness this asset I'm promote a favorable environment for corporate entrepreneurship, aiming for its growth, survival in the higher education market, and sustainability," it's important to acknowledge that this may be due to institutional characteristics. For instance, statutory organizations with professionals selected through competitions or public selections may differ from private organizations in terms of mobility and opportunities provided.

Additionally, on page 15, the author suggests implementing actions like "innovation awards, courses, and lectures on entrepreneurship." It's crucial to consider consulting institutional documents, such as the PDI, to contrast these results. These documents often outline institutional policies, and comparing the study's findings with them can provide valuable insights.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

The study contributions as presented appear to be primarily limited to the specific context of the institution under analysis. To enhance the research's broader significance, it would be beneficial to explore and articulate its potential contributions to the field of study and the broader scientific advancement in this area. Please consider expanding on these aspects. The study's contribution to the field of entrepreneurship and small business management is not clearly elucidated in the current presentation. The contributions provided seem to be more closely related to the specific context of the institution under analysis. It would be advantageous to further expound on and clarify the contributions of the study to the broader field of study.

7. General Evaluation

Indicate in the space below additional suggestions to the authors to improve the article, for example, in relation to: Form (structure, language, readability) or other useful comments to the authors.

I found the article to be well-structured. However, it does require several adjustments, particularly in terms of theoretical framework and the presentation of the instrument used. At times, I felt that certain concepts, such as intrapreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, and Community HEI, needed more thorough elaboration and adaptation to the context of the study.

Furthermore, there is a need to clarify the contribution that the study brings to the theoretical field of entrepreneurship and small business. It seems that the results and contributions predominantly focus on the institution presented. I have made several notes aimed at improving the quality of the work and increasing its chances of publication. Your dedication to these adjustments will likely enhance the overall quality of the article.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
- Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
- Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- I do NOT agree to open the review.

ROUND 2:

1st Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2024-08-05 05:51 PM

Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

The text is well written and structured. However, I still noticed several spelling errors. Several words are written without spacing, especially in the results and conclusions section. In addition, some terms could be revised, such as: "public power", "emailto", "theRector". I suggest a thorough revision for a final version. In accordance with standard language.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

The objective of the work is clear. Although the introduction could be more direct and succinct, to make the objective more tied to the theoretical justification. To the authors, please see this note only as a suggestion. Not necessarily as a mandatory correction.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

I was able to verify progress in relation to this part. There was an effort on the part of the authors to make the necessary adjustments. I will only make a few points: 1. There is a lack of a hypothesis to be tested, together with the theoretical argument. The authors could add a hypothesis that would be answered by empirical research; 2. The term "corporate entrepreneurship" is mentioned in the introduction and in the methodological procedures. However, there is no development of it in the theoretical discussion and no connection with the intrapreneur concept. I suggest keeping only the latter (intrapreneur).

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

The methodological part is clear and well presented.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

The results presented are consistent and are presented in a way that addresses the theoretical gap presented.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

The study aims to evaluate the issue of intrapreneurship in the context of an educational institution, using an instrument that is already known and widely validated in the literature. The study was well conducted and written, demonstrating the care that the authors took in its structuring. In addition, the authors responded to and addressed all the points requested in the previous analysis. Therefore, I believe that the study achieves its objective.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

As a general assessment, I see that the authors should carry out a general and detailed review, to address writing and editorial errors.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
I do NOT agree to open the review.

2nd Reviewer: Marcelo Kratz Mendes

Completed : 2024-09-15 09:20 AM

Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

■ Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

■ Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Suggestions for improvement and necessary formatting corrections:

1. Word Count Check: Ensure the article does not exceed the maximum limit of 8,500 words, including titles, abstracts, keywords, tables, figures, notes, appendices, and references.
2. Figures to Tables: Why are Figures 1, 2, and 3 presented as figures and not tables? Change them to tables and format them according to the journal's guidelines.
3. Adaptation of Figure 1: Figure 1 contains textual modifications from the original (e.g., "measures" changed to "measurement" and "sub-indexes" to "sub-indices"). Suggest adding "adapted from...". The author of Figure 1 also refers to it as a Table in his doctoral thesis.
4. Article Titles Consistency: Ensure the article titles are consistent across English, Portuguese, and Spanish versions.
5. Citations of Validated Studies: Cite studies that validated the questionnaire through its "psychometric properties."
6. Abstract in Spanish: Combine the two paragraphs into a single paragraph, as required by the journal's format.
7. References Review: Review references for consistency with the journal's guidelines. For example:
 - Correct format: from "Barbetta, Pedro Alberto. Estatística aplicada às ciências sociais. 9. ed. Florianópolis, SC: Ed. da UFSC, 2014. 315 p. (Coleção Didática) ISBN 9788532806666", to "Barbetta, P. A. (2014). Estatística aplicada às ciências sociais (9ª ed.). Florianópolis, SC: Ed. da UFSC."
 - Incorrect elements: References containing text in Portuguese (e.g., "Dissertação de Mestrado") and missing URLs for online documents, as in the example "Câmara dos Deputados (2010). Projeto de Lei nº 7.639, de 2010. Dispõe sobre a definição, qualificação, prerrogativas e finalidades das Instituições Comunitárias de Educação Superior - ICES".
 - Address inconsistencies in title capitalization, punctuation, and author name formatting. Suggest reviewing each reference according to the APA 7th edition guidelines.
8. Citations and References Consistency: Ensure all in-text citations appear in the reference list. For example, citations like "Fiorenze, 2017" and "Neesen, Caniëls, Vos, & de Jong, 2019" are missing from the references. Suggest using reference management software for accuracy.
9. Uncited References: Confirm that references such as "Meyer Júnior, V. (2014). A prática da administração universitária: contribuições para a teoria" are appropriately cited in the text. Suggest a review that all references listed are cited.
10. Citation Format: In parentheses, use "&" correctly, but in narrative citations, replace "&" with "and." Ensure all citations follow APA 7th edition guidelines, especially when citing multiple authors or using direct quotes. For example: "Engzell, Karabag & Yström (2023) illustrated this intrapreneurial logic as 'balancing between academic parameters and personal desires to initiate something new.'"
11. Intrapreneurship Definition: On page 4, the term "intrapreneurship" is mentioned but not explained in contrast to "corporate entrepreneurship." Since they are not synonyms, other authors should be cited to present the definition of "intrapreneurship" and clarify its relationship with corporate entrepreneurship. Ensure this distinction is clearly articulated.
12. Citation Length: Review the length of citations, such as the one from "Festa, 2015." It must adhere to the journal's guidelines—containing up to 40 words or three lines.

13. Use of Sociodemographic Variables: Clarify whether sociodemographic variables are used for results evaluation. Is there a correlation analysis, or does it only analyze management positions? What about age, gender, and length of service?
14. Literature Review: The literature review section mentions other analysis methods but does not specify them. Clearly highlight how these methods differ from the chosen method.
15. Agbor (2008) Citation: On page 5, the response letter indicated that this citation was removed, yet it remains. Review and make necessary corrections.
16. Methodology: Provide references for the triangulation (though mentioned in the abstract, the term is not used in the corresponding section) and content analysis methods used.
17. Data Presentation Section: Suggest renaming the "PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA" section to "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" to prevent confusion with data analysis methodology.
18. Table 3: Review the term "PORTARIA" used in Table 3 for accuracy.
19. Kamau (2018) Citation: On page 15, the citation appears to refer to another study. If the results are related or similar to those of the current work, this relationship and distinction should be described in more detail.
20. Suggestions at the End: Many suggestions are given without citations of studies supporting these institutional improvements. Suggest citing studies that advocate for the proposed improvements..

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
I do NOT agree to open the review.

3rd Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2025-01-01 02:41 PM
Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

■ Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

First of all, congratulations on the research and the choice of a very relevant theme in the field of innovation management and entrepreneurship. Below, I will highlight some points that I believe should be improved or adjusted in your work:

1. The text requires a thorough review of the English language. In several sections, such as the abstract, there are incorrectly written English words, for example: "robustnessto"; "programsfor." In the introduction, similar issues occur, such as "performancevariables" and "emailto." These errors are present throughout the text and need attention.
2. In the introduction, you could emphasize that there is a concentration of private HEIs within a few large companies listed on the Brazilian stock exchange. This type of business has significant differences compared to public and community HEIs, which should be highlighted.
3. The theoretical gap in the work could be expanded by including more authors. Currently, the study heavily relies on one main reference—De Keyser and Vandenbempt (2023)—to define the research problem.
4. In the chapter on Intrapreneurship in Academic Management, there are numerous references to intrapreneurship in general, but limited discussion specific to intrapreneurship within HEIs. This aspect should be further explored and strengthened. Additionally, Figure 1 presents descriptive information about the construct "Structure and Leadership" in Portuguese, while the "Culture" construct provides measurement information related to leadership. These elements need clarification and alignment.
5. The chapter on methodological procedures is well-structured and describes the research process effectively. However, careful attention should be given to English writing, as there are several errors that require correction.
6. In Table 3, the authors present results of "Comparisons by possession of appointment decree," but these findings are not elaborated on or discussed in the context of existing literature on intrapreneurship within HEIs.

The results shown in Figure 3 and the authors' considerations should provide deeper insights into intrapreneurship within HEIs, particularly regarding the financial implications of fostering intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship in these institutions. As noted earlier, there is a significant difference between community HEIs and corporate HEIs, which are essentially enterprises operating in the "educational market" and are often less focused on research and quality education. The authors do not make this distinction, treating community HEIs and corporate HEIs as the same:

"However, the company they work for does not stimulate nor harness this asset to promote a favorable environment for corporate entrepreneurship, aiming for its growth, survival in the higher education market, and sustainability (Kamau, 2018)."

7. Regarding the document analysis provided by the HEIs, more insights should be extracted, especially concerning the PNI (Plano de Desenvolvimento Institucional) and its relationship with the main constructs of intrapreneurial intensity. The university's low intrapreneurial intensity should be contrasted with the elements identified in the analyzed documents.
8. It appears that professors were not included in the surveyed workforce. This point should be emphasized in the research, as professors represent a critical workforce in HEIs and hold a strategic position to either facilitate or hinder the intrapreneurial process.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.
Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
I do NOT agree to open the review.