



# Peer-Review Statements

Andrew Johnston<sup>(✉)</sup>, Bharti Pandya, Hesham Allam, Kavita Shah, Nicole Shammas,  
and Nayela Mohammad

Higher Colleges of Technology – Dubai Women’s Campus, Dubai, UAE  
{ajohnston, bpandya, hallam, kshah, nshammas, nmohammad1}@hct.ac.ae

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *HCT International General Education Conference on October 5, 2022 in Dubai, UAE*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *editorial 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 *at least 2 reviewer(s)* independently.

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. After the initial screening, they were sent for peer review by matching each paper’s topic with the reviewers’ expertise, taking into account any competing interests. 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.

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

*See Appendix 1 below for the review criteria checklist.*

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. *All papers were checked through in house similarity checker.*

### 3 KEY METRICS

<i>Total (conference) submissions</i>	322
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	28
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	15
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	53%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	6

### 4 COMPETING INTERESTS

Editors have recused themselves from reviewing any papers closely associated with them and delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.

#### APPENDIX 1: REVIEW CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	1 - Excellent	2 - Very Good	2- Good	4 - Fair	5 - Poor
Appropriateness for this book					
Adequacy of the abstract					
Adequacy of background/Introduction					
Adequacy of analysis of issues					
Clarity of presentation					
Organization of chapter					
References/citations Supports claims with the literature					
Contributes to knowledge in the field					
English grammar/vocabulary and punctuation is <i>mostly</i> correct and to academic standard					

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

