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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 is significant for the scientific community as it provides a nuanced understanding of the psychological and behavioral factors contributing to academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in Ghana. By exploring the interplay between self-efficacy and personality traits, the study offers valuable insights into how individual differences influence ethical decision-making in academic settings. Such findings can inform the development of targeted interventions and policies to mitigate academic dishonesty, promoting academic integrity and improving the quality of higher education. Additionally, the research adds to the broader discourse on academic dishonesty by providing context-specific evidence, which is particularly relevant for educational stakeholders in sub-Saharan Africa. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, *"****Influence of Self-Efficacy and Personality in Academic Dishonesty Among Undergraduate Students in Ghana,****"* is clear and descriptive, effectively conveying the key variables and focus of the study. However, it could be slightly refined for better readability and appeal. But if for any reason the author may want to change the here's a suggested alternative:**"Examining the Role of Self-Efficacy and Personality Traits in Academic Dishonesty Among Undergraduate Students in Ghana"**This revision emphasizes the study's investigative nature and adds specificity by referring to "personality traits," which may resonate more with academic readers. |  |
| 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 is informative and covers the essential components of the study, including the objectives, methodology, findings, and implications. However, it could benefit from slight refinements to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness. Below are some suggestions for improvement:Additions:1. **Background/Justification:** Briefly mention why academic dishonesty is a pressing issue in the Ghanaian or broader educational context to establish relevance.
2. **Key Findings:** Highlight specific statistics or data points (e.g., prevalence rates) to provide a more concrete understanding of the issue.
3. **Recommendations:** Include a brief mention of the strategies proposed to mitigate academic dishonesty, as this adds practical relevance.

Deletions/Adjustments:1. The phrase "Three scales addressed the hypotheses and research questions" could be expanded to specify the names or types of scales used.
2. The conclusion could explicitly state how the findings contribute to existing literature or future research.
 |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, as it outlines clear research objectives, employs an appropriate methodology, and presents coherent findings. The use of a cross-sectional questionnaire-based design, descriptive statistics, and regression analysis are suitable for investigating relationships between self-efficacy, personality traits, and academic dishonesty. Additionally, the focus on predictors such as conscientiousness and openness aligns well with established psychological theories, supporting the study's validity. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references listed are diverse and include both older and more recent works. However, for the manuscript to be robust and scientifically up-to-date, it should emphasize more recent studies, particularly from the last five years. Below is an evaluation of the references and suggestions for improvement:Observations:1. **Sufficient Range**: The references cover a wide array of related topics, such as academic dishonesty, personality traits, and the impact of COVID-19 on online exams.
2. **Outdated Sources**: Several references are more than 15 years old (e.g., Pavela, 1978; Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Trevino, 1993). While these may be foundational, they could be supplemented with newer studies.
3. **Recent Additions**: Some recent works (e.g., Baran & Jonason, 2020; Surahman & Wang, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022) strengthen the manuscript's relevance.
4. **COVID-19 Context**: The inclusion of sources related to academic dishonesty during the COVID-19 pandemic is timely and relevant.
5. **Gaps in Region-Specific Context**: While there are references focused on Ghana and Malaysia, there seems to be a lack of studies specifically addressing academic dishonesty in Sierra Leone or West Africa, apart from a few (e.g., Ampiah & Ayertey, 2016; Edwards, 2019).
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with a formal tone and clear expression. However, slight adjustments for flow and consistency, such as the use of "such as" instead of "like" would enhance its formality and readability for academic audiences. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The study effectively explores the forms and prevalence of academic dishonesty among Ghanaian students, with clear identification of key predictors like self-efficacy and conscientiousness. However, it would be beneficial to provide more context on why these factors were chosen and how the results can inform broader educational policies or practices. Additionally, the paper could expand on the strategies for mitigating academic dishonesty, offering more specific recommendations for institutions to address these issues effectively. |  |
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