Review of: "Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty: Insights from the University of Tehran"

Samuel L. Beaumont[1]

1 Averett College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, this topic is worthy of study and is a phenomenon seen at universities across the globe. Academic dishonesty is something we all struggle with on a regular basis, even at the highest levels in academia. For example, here in the United States, the president of Harvard University was just forced to resign due to plagiarism allegations.

Points to consider:

The author should specifically discuss the literature/knowledge gap this study is filling.

Perhaps the author should increase the review of literature to take into account cultural differences on what constitutes academic dishonesty. Limiting the review to only five studies may not present a full picture of the issue, and including additional studies may increase scholarly discussion.

In the introduction section, it seems a few items were repeated, such as the number of students attending universities and the reference to Declan Butler. I suggest rewording so this information only needs to be presented once.

I find the discussion on a 'moderate approach' and 'relaxed enforcement' interesting and worthy of further discussion. A question that begs answering is "Are instructors under pressure to ignore academic dishonesty and pass students to keep enrollment rates high?"

The sample of 300 participants was adequate for statistical comparison by gender. I am not sure if we can derive statistically significant findings by year or program of study due to the smaller number of students in each category.

It would be helpful to define 'super senior" in the methods section.

How was the questionnaire developed and tested for validity and reliability?

Since IRB is not established in Iran, it might prove helpful to provide more discussion on how student data is is protected and anonymity is ensured. Perhaps using the Belmont Report as a foundation?

On table 3, I would change the nomenclature from "man/woman" to "male/female."

In the discussion section, I did not see recommendations for future research, or where these findings could lead next. Perhaps more discussion and study on generative AI would be appropriate – what is the university policy? IE - No AI use, full AI use with human oversight, AI-assisted editing, etc.? How can universities continually educate and reinforce the

importance of ethical writing and publication?

This survey could have been conducted among professors, and the results could have been compared. In addition, documented cases of dishonesty could be referenced to see if there is alignment with student perceptions, professor perceptions, and actual documented cases of dishonesty.

I also suggest additional proofreading and editing to strengthen some awkwardly worded sentences.