

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJARR_117667
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Self-Efficacy and Personality in Academic Dishonesty of Undergraduate Students: Implication for Corruption
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is. Discussing dishonesty, especially academic dishonesty is important. The consequences of academic dishonesty are far-reaching. It not only undermines the integrity of educational institutions but also harms students who engage in it. A damaged reputation can follow both the cheater and the institution they represent. Academic misconduct, in any form, poses a fundamental threat to the integrity of education, our social fabric, and the teaching profession.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate</p> <p>3. The abstract of this manuscript has been written comprehensively. It can be seen from the existence of all abstract moves as stated by Hyland (2000). They are : Background, aim, methods, results, and conclusion</p> <p>4. The manuscript has follow the template of this journal in which for research paper the structure is : Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion,</p> <p>5. This manuscript is scientifically correct since it has been done through several research procedures, such as problem identification, reviewing literature, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, and reporting the results in the form of article.</p> <p>6. Actually, the references are sufficient, there are 68 references. However not all them are recent/up to date. 51% of the references are old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language quality of this manuscript has been suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Change the old date references with the current ones.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Diah Kurniati
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muria Kudus, Indonesia