



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56259

Title: Plagiarism In Academic Research: Causes, Consequences, And Preventive Strategies

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	...			
Techn. Quality		...		
Clarity		...		
Significance	...			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Ishrat Fatima

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The paper addresses a highly relevant and contemporary issue in higher education plagiarism and its impact on academic integrity. The abstract clearly outlines the scope of the study by mentioning the meaning, historical background, types, causes, consequences, and preventive strategies of plagiarism. It effectively highlights both intentional and unintentional plagiarism and references the UGC Regulations, 2018, which adds policy relevance to the discussion. However, the abstract could be more concise and grammatically refined to improve clarity and scholarly tone.

The introduction successfully establishes the importance of the topic in the digital era, emphasizing how easy access to online resources has increased plagiarism risks. The discussion on academic pressure, lack of citation knowledge, and institutional expectations provides a realistic academic context. However, the section contains several grammatical errors, awkward sentence constructions, and repetition. Structurally, the introduction would benefit from clearer argument progression and stronger academic language. The ideas are relevant, but the presentation needs refinement for publication standards.

The section on the meaning and definitions of plagiarism is informative and well-structured. The etymological explanation of the Latin word *plagiarius* strengthens the conceptual foundation. Definitions quoted from scholars such as Wilson Mizner, Fishman, and Roig help in providing theoretical grounding. However, the paper does not critically compare these definitions or synthesize them into a cohesive analytical framework. The inclusion of direct quotations is useful, but the absence of proper citation formatting weakens academic rigor. The historical background section adds depth by tracing plagiarism from ancient times to the modern era. The reference to Martial accusing Fidentinus provides an engaging historical starting point. The inclusion of famous plagiarism allegations involving figures like William Shakespeare, Leonardo da Vinci, Helen Keller, and Rudyard Kipling makes the section interesting and illustrative. However, some examples lack academic referencing and critical analysis. The discussion sometimes shifts toward narrative storytelling rather than analytical evaluation. Additionally, a few historical claims would require stronger scholarly evidence to enhance credibility.

The section on types of plagiarism is one of the strongest parts of the paper. It provides an extensive classification including direct plagiarism, mosaic plagiarism, self-plagiarism, outsourced plagiarism, secondary source plagiarism, bibliography plagiarism, and others. The detailed categorization demonstrates comprehensive understanding. However, some categories overlap (e.g., "Hired Plagiarism" and "Outsourcing"), and self-plagiarism is repeated twice. Conceptual clarity and structural reorganization would make this section more academically precise. The causes of plagiarism are thoughtfully discussed and reflect practical realities of academic life. The paper correctly identifies lack of awareness, academic pressure, poor research skills, technological influence, fear of failure, and institutional gaps as key contributing factors. This section shows good analytical insight. However, it would benefit from stronger engagement with existing empirical studies cited in the reference list. Currently, the discussion

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

remains largely descriptive rather than research-based. The analysis of consequences under the UGC (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations, 2018 is particularly valuable in the Indian academic context. The explanation of graded penalties based on similarity index percentages adds practical relevance. The inclusion of the penalty table enhances clarity. However, formatting inconsistencies and grammatical errors reduce professionalism. Additionally, the paper could strengthen this section by comparing Indian regulations with international frameworks such as COPE guidelines.

The preventive strategies section is practical and solution-oriented. The emphasis on awareness programs, citation training, plagiarism detection tools, research skill development, time management, and institutional enforcement reflects a balanced preventive approach. The mention of tools such as Turnitin and Grammarly adds applied value. However, the discussion could be enhanced by critically evaluating the effectiveness and limitations of plagiarism detection software rather than simply listing tools. The discussion section appropriately synthesizes earlier arguments and reiterates the complexity of plagiarism as both an ethical and institutional issue. The acknowledgement that regulations alone are insufficient and that ethical culture must be cultivated is a strong concluding insight. However, the section largely summarizes previous points rather than offering new interpretations or theoretical contributions.

The conclusion effectively reinforces the importance of academic honesty and ethical research culture. It highlights collective responsibility among students, faculty, and institutions. The concluding remarks are relevant but would benefit from a sharper, more impactful final statement and a brief mention of future research directions. From a structural and technical perspective, the paper demonstrates comprehensive coverage of the topic but requires significant language editing. There are numerous grammatical errors, inconsistent formatting, repetition, and citation style inconsistencies. Some references include URLs with "utm_source=chatgpt.com," which should be removed in a formal submission. The referencing style should be standardized (APA/MLA/Chicago) and properly formatted throughout.

Overall, the paper is thematically strong, socially relevant, and comprehensive in scope. It successfully combines conceptual discussion, historical perspective, regulatory framework, and preventive strategies. However, to reach publishable academic standards, it requires major revisions in language clarity, structural organization, analytical depth, referencing accuracy, and removal of redundancies. With careful editing and stronger engagement with scholarly literature, this paper has the potential to become a well-structured and impactful contribution to discussions on academic integrity and plagiarism in higher education.