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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it explores the critical issue of academic dishonesty, a pervasive problem that undermines the integrity of education systems globally. By focusing on the role of self-efficacy and personality traits in predicting dishonest behaviors among Ghanaian undergraduate students, it fills a research gap in the context of Ghana's higher education system. The study’s findings provide valuable insights into the psychological and behavioral predictors of academic misconduct, offering a foundation for developing targeted interventions to promote academic integrity. Additionally, the research has implications for educational policymakers and institutional administrators, as it underscores the need for systemic strategies to mitigate academic fraud and foster ethical practices in academia. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title, **"Influence of Self-Efficacy and Personality in Academic Dishonesty Among Undergraduate Students in Ghana,"** is suitable as it clearly reflects the primary focus of the study, including the key variables (self-efficacy, personality traits, and academic dishonesty) and the context (undergraduate students in Ghana). However, to enhance its clarity and appeal, a more concise and engaging alternative could be:**"Examining Self-Efficacy and Personality Traits as Predictors of Academic Dishonesty Among Ghanaian Undergraduates."**This revised title emphasizes the predictive nature of the research while maintaining a clear focus on the core variables and context. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive as it summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, there is room for improvement to enhance its clarity and informativeness. Here are some suggestions:Additions:1. **Highlight the key findings quantitatively**: Include specific statistics or percentages to provide a more concrete understanding of the prevalence of academic dishonesty and the strength of predictors like self-efficacy and conscientiousness.
	* For example, mention the R² value or the specific predictive strength of personality traits and self-efficacy.
2. **Clarify implications**: Expand on the implications by specifying how the findings can inform interventions or policies in educational institutions.
3. **State limitations**: Briefly mention any significant limitations of the study (e.g., reliance on self-reported data or use of convenience sampling) to give a balanced perspective.

Deletions:1. **Avoid vague phrasing**: The phrase "high levels of self-efficacy and conscientiousness among students, yet academic dishonesty was still present" could be clarified. Instead, specify how these traits influenced or mitigated dishonest behaviors.
2. **Repetition**: Remove redundant mentions of the study’s purpose and focus to streamline the abstract.
 |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its overall approach and methodology, but there are aspects that could be scrutinized for improvement or clarification. Here are my observations:**Sample Characteristics**: The sample includes 453 students, but it is unclear whether this convenience sample is sufficiently representative of the broader population of Ghanaian undergraduates. Additionally, the mean age (30 years) seems atypical for undergraduates and requires explanation. **Statistical Reporting**: While the study provides some statistical outcomes, such as means and standard deviations, it lacks effect sizes and confidence intervals for regression analyses, which are essential for interpreting the practical significance of findings.**Causal Claims**: The manuscript occasionally implies causation (e.g., "Self-efficacy predicts academic dishonesty"), but as a cross-sectional study, it can only establish correlations, not causality.**Bias in Self-Reporting**: The reliance on self-reported data introduces the possibility of social desirability bias, which may have led participants to underreport academic dishonesty.**Cultural Context**: While the study emphasizes Ghanaian students, it would benefit from a deeper discussion of how cultural or systemic factors in Ghana might uniquely influence academic dishonesty compared to global trends. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient, as they provide a mix of foundational theories and recent studies. However, there are areas where the reference list could be improved to ensure it is comprehensive and up-to-date. Here’s the analysis:**Limited Recent Literature**: While there are recent references, many cited studies are older (e.g., pre-2010). The paper would benefit from incorporating more studies from the past five years, especially concerning academic dishonesty and its predictors in a digital learning environment.**Regional Context**: The study focuses on Ghanaian students, but references specific to Ghana or Sub-Saharan Africa are sparse. More regionally relevant literature could contextualize findings better.**Online Academic Dishonesty**: Given the rising prevalence of online learning, studies on academic dishonesty in virtual settings could enrich the discussion.References for Inclusion:1. **For Recent Trends in Academic Dishonesty**:
	* Surahman, E., & Wang, T. H. (2022). Academic dishonesty and trustworthy assessment in online learning: A systematic literature review. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 38(6), 1535-1553. DOI:10.1111/jcal.12712
	* Zhao, L., & Mao, H. (2022). Academic dishonesty and its relations to peer cheating and culture: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 100455. DOI:10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100455
2. **For African Context on Academic Integrity**:
	* Ampiah, J. G., & Ayertey, F. (2016). Examination malpractice in West Africa: A case study of WAEC. International Journal of Educational Development Using ICT, 12, 19-31.
3. **For Personality and Academic Dishonesty**:
	* Baran, L., & Jonason, P. K. (2020). Academic dishonesty among university students: The roles of psychopathy, motivation, and self-efficacy. PLOS ONE, 15(8), e0238141. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0238141
 |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the article is mostly clear and suitable for scholarly communication. |  |
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