

# Peer-Review Statements

Dr. Diah Andika Sari<sup>1,\*</sup> Dr. Mukhti Amini<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Terbuka

.Email: [diah.andika@umj](mailto:diah.andika@umj)

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the ICECE 6 Conference during *September 7 and 8 2021* in Early Childhood Education Faculty of Education Universitas Negeri Padang. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of *Scientific Committee* and approved by the Editor-in-Chief, who affirms that this document is a truthful description of the conference's review process.

## 1. REVIEW PROCEDURE

The reviews were double blind. Each submission was examined by two reviewers independently. *The conference submission used konfrenzy management system.*

The submission were first screened to the generic suitability and quality and looking at the relevancy of the topic matching. After the initial screening, the paper were sent to the reviewers' expertise to look at taking into account any requirement of expected paper has been matched. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it had received favourable recommendations from the two reviewers.

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

Paper should fulfil the requirement of the article structure; abstracts, keywords, introduction, methods, results and discussion, conclusion, and references. The reviewers will suggest authors to revise the paper based on the suggestion given and resubmit the final paper.

## 2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers were instructed to assess the quality of submissions solely based on the academic merit of their content along the following dimensions:

1. Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;

2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty of the research;
3. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
4. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.
5. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. For plagiarism check is used Turnitin checker, the similarity should be under 20 % .

## 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	90
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	70
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	53
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	57%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	8

## 4. COMPETING INTERESTS

In the process of review and making decision, neither Editor in Chief, nor scientific committee declares any competing interests.