

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

Sihem Salem

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title

1. Specify the case of your study: Insights from Students...

Introduction:

1. Provide a clear definition of what is considered academic dishonesty in Iran.
2. Avoid repetition of ideas; for example, the idea that the internet is a double-edged sword is mentioned twice.
3. Please mention the tools that universities use for detecting plagiarism and whether they are available to students. Also, discuss the regulations about academic dishonesty in Iran.
4. Talk about the educational system in Iran, then focus on Tehran. Specify whether academic dishonesty is taught at the university. Also, talk about the role of the ethics committee in the university, if any.
5. The research questions are missing.
6. Clearly, precis the aims of your study.

Literature Review

1. Justify the choice of studies published in Persian journals.
2. The literature review should be written critically, but you have just listed a number of studies. Please discuss these studies critically in relation to your research. Also, highlight the similarities and differences between them.
3. Write about the original contributions of your study.
4. The theoretical framework is missing in your article. What theory have you used to analyse and interpret your data?
5. Start your literature review with an overview and conclude it with a summary.

Method

1. Is your sample representative?
2. Have you conducted a pilot study?
3. Talk about the validity and reliability of your research.
4. Have you done interrater reliability?

Results

1. You mentioned “Our study focused on examining students' and professors' perceptions of academic dishonesty (AD)”, but you have just included students as participants?
2. Add some interpretations of the findings.

Conclusion

1. Mention the authors whose findings are different from yours, and explain the reason behind this difference by highlighting the originality in your research.
2. Write about the implications of your findings.
3. Add some suggestions and recommendations.