



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 should be edited for language use.</p> <p>The author should reflect on the fact that it is general practice for students to submit their work to turnitin, which generates a report for both students and faculty and, if a limit is exceeded, must rework the papers. There is, therefore, no additional burden on the faculty member.</p>	<p>Yes, Turnitn is important like an usefull tool to find the plagiarism in doctoral theses, research papers and so on that I have mentioned in my Letter to the editor, but Turnitin is under my opinion unnecessary lost of time for general practice student's works in everyday faculty work.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	