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

Mark James[1]

1 Columbus State University

I want to thank the authors for their work.

The paper's writing needs editing. The paper needs more citations and clearer writing. For example, the 1st sentence needs citations to support the statement that dishonesty and misconduct have been some of the main issues in academia. The second sentence states that overlooking academic dishonesty will culminate in a debacle. What is a debacle? The authors need to be more precise and clear in their writing. I found this issue throughout the paper.

The paper structure goes from the literature review into the methods section without answering the so-what question. The authors need to make a clear statement about the question they are trying to answer. Be specific—what question are you trying to answer?

The survey measures perceptions of academic dishonesty. Why is measuring that important? What insight do I get by measuring that construct? The authors need to frame their paper better.

The tables look like they were cut and pasted from a statistical package. Please take the time to create tables that summarize the information and/or present it in a more readable format.

The design of the analysis is weak, as correlational studies are inherently weak statistical methods for examining data.

The paper needs work. Please rewrite the paper and focus on explaining why you did what you did and why it is important.