



# Peer-Review Statements

Tulus Suryanto<sup>1</sup>(✉), Liza Alili Sulejmani<sup>2</sup>, Juh ary Ali<sup>3</sup>, Ravinder Rena<sup>4</sup>,  
Simon Grima<sup>5</sup>, and Ramona Piryu<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia  
admin@icostelm.org

<sup>2</sup> International Balkan University, Skopje, North Macedonia

<sup>3</sup> Asia E-University, Subang Jaya, Malaysia

<sup>4</sup> Durban University of Technology, Durban, Republic of South Africa

<sup>5</sup> University of Malta, Msida, Malta

<sup>6</sup> University of Craiova (UCV), Craiova, Romania

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *ICOSTELM 2022* during 4–5 November 2022 in *Bandar Lampung, Indonesia*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [name of the review body, for example, *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 review*. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewer(s) independently. The conference submission management system was <http://www.icostelm.org/index.php/register>.

The submissions were first screened for scope, similarity checking and generic quality. 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. The percentage level of articles plagiarism is not more than 15%
3. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
4. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
5. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;

6. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher.

### 3 Key Metrics

Total submissions	156
Number of articles sent for peer review	132
Number of accepted articles	21
Acceptance rate	15,9%
Number of reviewers	36

**Competing Interests.** Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest.

**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.

