



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_65147
Title of the Manuscript:	Academic Fraud in Online System During the Covid-19 Pandemic: Evidence from Lampung - Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear what Research design the researcher used to conduct the study. The author told us that he/she used purposive sampling however the way he/she tried to justify the reason is not convincing. Thus it would be better if the author make clear that whether the participants of the study are the only students taking online final semester assessment We don't know the number of participants. Thus, the number of students participated in the study has to be mentioned in the methodology section As the article is open for international readers the author has to tell us about "the context of the study". for example accounting vocational high school represent in the education system of Indonesia (is it part of the high school or different?, what type of students are enrolled in such category? Please give us briefs about Indonesian education structures The need for conducting the study is not mentioned. Why the author want to study the problem? Is it because academic fraud in online a high concern in Indonesia or something else? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Explain the research design and sampling technique in the "abstract section"</p> <p>There are serious spelling errors throughout the article (e.g. methodologi, preasure, rasionlization in the abstract and key words). Take a look and correct it all</p>	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Back-uping the introduction section with previous research works related to academic fraud in online learning would make the "introduction" section more informative It would be better add quality to your paper if you could have seen whether sex (being male or female) attached with academic fraud We don't know the prevalence of academic fraud among the participants of the study. Your study would be better if you could have examined the prevalence so that your recommendation would be meaningful 	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Wondifraw Dejene Chala</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia</i>