

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

Elahe Hosseini¹

¹ Yazd University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this paper.

- You need a discussion section. The discussion challenges your findings and determines the degree of compatibility with previous research.
- The discussion section needs to highlight what is new in your findings and what we can learn from a study conducted in this interesting and understudied context. Whilst the introduction sets the stage for the study by justifying the relevance of the study, the discussion is the most important section as it is in the discussion that it is all brought together, and the authors illustrate how and why the study findings advance the literature. Therefore, the discussion needs to illustrate the new insights—the contributions—in a clear and compelling manner. In other words, illustrate what we know now that we did not know before or, in effect, to clearly illustrate the contribution of the study to the different bodies of literature. Furthermore, what are the future research directions based on this new framework?
- Theoretical Contributions: Addressing all the points mentioned above will lead to a more in-depth presentation of your data, which has a clearer theoretical contribution. What are the theoretical contributions?
- The authors need to draw substantive conclusions from their results and suggest, develop recommendations for further research.