

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

Lilian Anthonysamy¹

¹ Multimedia University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty: Insights from the University of Tehran

Abstract

1. The abstract provides a clear overview of the paper's focus on academic dishonesty in Iranian universities, specifically at the University of Tehran. However, it lacks specific details about the methodology and key findings. Suggest providing a brief summary of the research design, key variables, and major findings to give readers a better understanding of the study.

Introduction

1. The introduction lacks clarity and organization. It would benefit from a clearer structure outlining the purpose, background, and significance of the study. Ensure a logical flow from general background information to the specific context of the study in Tehran.
2. The language is occasionally informal ("Being too tough on it will disperse students") and could be refined for academic writing. Ensure a consistent and formal tone throughout the introduction.
3. The introduction lacks a clear and concise thesis statement. Clearly state the main objective of the paper, which is addressing academic dishonesty in Iranian universities, and how the study contributes to existing knowledge.

Review of Literature

1. The literature review is informative but could be more organized. Consider categorizing studies based on themes or types of academic dishonesty to enhance clarity and coherence.
2. While the literature review includes studies from Persian journals, it would be valuable to incorporate a few key findings from international literature on academic dishonesty for a more comprehensive perspective.
3. Similar to the introduction, ensure consistent citation formatting in the literature review.

Method

1. The methodology section provides detailed information, but it can be made clearer. Consider breaking down the section into subsections (e.g., Participants, Procedure, Measures) for improved readability.
2. Clearly state the ethical considerations and precautions taken for participant anonymity and confidentiality. Even in the

absence of an IRB certificate, emphasize adherence to ethical standards.

3. Provide more information on the reasoning behind choosing the three faculties and the specific criteria for inclusion, ensuring transparency in the sampling process.
4. Clearly describe the process of refining the questionnaire and provide a rationale for the items selected. Additionally, consider presenting a few sample items to give readers a sense of the questionnaire's content.

Conclusion

1. Separate conclusion and discussion. Don't put them together under the Conclusion section.
2. The paper lacks a dedicated discussion section to interpret the findings and discuss their broader implications. This section is crucial for tying the results back to the research questions and offering insights for future studies.