



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_48304
Title of the Manuscript:	The Turnitin Plagiarism Check-up System – Problem for Professors instead for Students
Type of the Article	Letter to the Editor

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>The letter to the editor is very simplified, without arguments and epistemological foundations; there is little reflection on the current of thought used in writing.</p> <p>There is a need to broaden the reflections and epistemological foundation, since there is only one reference in the text. Attend to standards of formatting and writing of scientific work. A letter to the editor aims to present and defend the proposal of the theory defended in the text, to address the main concepts related to the theory, to highlight issues of relevance, to demystify some mistaken arguments, to cite the main objectives, commitments and challenges of the theme for its establishment as scientific theory, its methodological criteria and its national and international specialized literature.</p>	<p>I have added additional data in my short letter Using a few additional references.</p> <p>As we can see, in some countries like in Pakistan, North African countries the writing Of scientific paper is at "low branches". In such Countries nobody have not heard about Turnitin. In some undeveloped countries Scientist have heard about it, but the use is at the low Level.</p> <p>So, for us who know for such system it is Appropriate to use it, but not always and not For unimportant students' work like exams etc, And that is point of my Letter to Editor, Not to Burden professors for every unimportant students' Work to avoid overburdening of professors.</p> <p>I think that I am totally right!</p> <p>I appreciate Turnitin, but I can not become the slave Of such system that is appropriate for serous check-ups.</p> <p>It would be interesting to see reactions of readers on my Opinion.</p> <p>Journals must be critical and allow different opinions!</p>
Minor REVISION comments	The text needs expanded, reformulated and improved, according to guidelines given above, for a new submission to the journal.	
Optional/General comments	Unfortunately, the text presents corrections that are primordial so that it can be submitted again for evaluation of this magazine.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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