



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	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.  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.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The text needs expanded, reformulated and improved, according to guidelines given above, for a new submission to the journal.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Unfortunately, the text presents corrections that are primordial so that it can be submitted again for evaluation of this magazine.	

**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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Gisele Marcia de Oliveira Freitas</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Federal University of Bahia, Brazil</i></b>