Peer-Review Statements

Mohamed Khaldi[1(✉)], Mehdi Kaddouri[2], and Mohamed Erradi[3]

[1] Professor-Researcher at Higher Normal School, Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tetouan, Morocco
medkhaldi@yahoo.fr, m.khaldi1@uae.ac.ma

[2] Professor-Researcher at the Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Mohammed Premier University, Oujda, Morocco

[3] Professor-Researcher at Higher Normal School, Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tetouan, Morocco

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *E-Learning and Smart Engineering Systems (ELSES)* during *11 to 13 May 2023* in *Higher Normal School, Tetouan, Morocco*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *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 *at least 2* reviewers independently.

The conference submission management system was through our website

The review procedure for submitted articles entails several key steps to ensure quality and originality. Articles must be presented in English and in Word format, adhering to the prescribed length of 6-13 pages, inclusive of figures, tables, and references as per the Springer template. Authors are required to provide their names, affiliations, and contact emails on the platform, along with an attached abstract or working paper using the provided template. The lead author is designated as the primary presenter, and the corresponding author takes responsibility for updates and communication. In case the lead author is unable to attend, timely notification is essential for proper certificate distribution. Reviewers are prompted to evaluate various aspects of the paper, including significance, originality, technical quality, awareness of related work, clarity of presentation, and organizational structure. They are also encouraged to comment extensively, providing constructive feedback on methodological approach, modeling, experiments, figures, tables, and data, totaling over 100 words. Additionally, reviewers are asked to assess the paper's advantages and disadvantages, leading to a final recommendation ranging from Strongly Reject to Strongly Accept. This comprehensive review process ensures the conference maintains high standards of scholarly excellence.

M. Khaldi—Editors-in-Chief of the ELSES.

© The Author(s) 2023
M. Khaldi et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the E-Learning and Smart Engineering Systems (ELSES 2023)*, Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 14,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-360-3_1

2 QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers employ a set of quality criteria to evaluate submitted papers. These criteria encompass various dimensions crucial for assessing the scholarly merit and contribution of a manuscript:

1. Significance of the main idea(s): Reviewers assess the importance and relevance of the research question or problem addressed in the paper. They consider whether the findings have implications for the field.
2. Originality: Reviewers gauge the novelty of the research, examining whether the approach, methodology, or findings offer a fresh perspective or contribute new insights to the existing body of knowledge.
3. Technical quality of the paper: This criterion pertains to the rigor and robustness of the research methodology, including the experimental design, data collection, and analysis techniques. Reviewers assess the appropriateness of the methods employed.
4. Awareness of related work: Reviewers evaluate the extent to which the authors demonstrate familiarity with prior research in the field. They assess whether the paper appropriately references and engages with relevant literature.
5. Clarity of presentation: Reviewers consider the clarity, coherence, and organization of the manuscript. They evaluate the effectiveness of the writing style, structure, and the logical flow of information.
6. Organization of the manuscript: This criterion pertains to the overall structure and coherence of the paper. Reviewers assess whether the sections (e.g., introduction, methodology, results, discussion) are well-organized and if the transitions between them are smooth.
7. References: Reviewers check the accuracy and appropriateness of the citations and references provided. They ensure that relevant sources are appropriately acknowledged.
8. Paper Length: Reviewers assess whether the length of the manuscript is appropriate for the depth and scope of the research presented. They consider whether the paper effectively balances brevity with the need for comprehensive coverage.

Reviewers use these criteria as a framework to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the manuscript, which ultimately informs the decision on whether to accept or reject the paper for publication. This systematic approach ensures that accepted papers meet high standards of quality and contribute meaningfully to the academic discourse in their respective fields.

3 KEY METRICS

Total submissions	107
Number of articles sent for peer review	107
Number of accepted articles	52
Acceptance rate	48.59 %
Number of reviewers	50

4 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.