



Peer-Review Statements

Carlos Sousa de Reis ^{1,*} Osman Titrek ² Jose Gijon Puerta ³

¹ University of Coimbra

² Sakarya University

³ Granada University

*Editor-in-Chief of the [ICLEL 23]. Email: iclelconferece @icel.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [International Conference on Lifelong Learning and Leadership for ALL-ICLEL 23] during [6-8 July 2023,] in [University of Coimbra, Portugal]. 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 [number, e.g., at least 2] reviewer(s) independently.

[If you use a conference or submission system mention it like for example: The conference submission management system was iclelchair.com]

[Please describe the overall process of review for your conference. Example text: The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. When abstracts are uploaded, they are reviewed by the editors and abstracts that are inappropriate for the conference topic or that raise doubts about academic quality are rejected outright. 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.]

[Any efforts in improving peer review should also appear in this section; for example, how reviewers are recused from the handling of papers by closely related authors, steps taken to reduce unconscious bias, etc.]

ICLEL Conferences is a completely blind review and the reviewers do not know the authors. Again, the authors do not know which reviewer they are being evaluated by. This method increases the validity and reliability of the review process. The suggestions of the reviewers are also shared with the anonymous authors and the necessary corrections are made and approval is obtained from the reviewers for the corrections made anonymously.

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 *[Note: please summarise your criteria and order them by importance; the following list is an example]:*

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.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. *[You can add your own efforts to stop and detect plagiarism here as well]*

In addition to these criteria, all authors are asked to submit a plagiarism report themselves and those with a rate below 20% are eliminated.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	146
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	89
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	37
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	41,57%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	20

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

There are no conflicts of interest related to this conference proceeding and the editors have equal legal rights and approval. Also this conference AB Beyond the Limits: Developing Entrepreneurship through Creativity (Project No: 2020-1-TR01-KA203-093989).

For this reason, the logos of the EU Turkish National Agency and the project logo and Disclaimer statement provided by the project coordinator must be included in the first 3 pages.

The Disclaimer: This Project is financed by the European Union in the scope of Erasmus+ Program. The information and views set out in this presentation are those of EU Beyond the Limits Project Group (project coordinator of the project Prof. Dr. Osman Titrek), as the project senior short term expert and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union and/or Republic of Turkey in any ways. Neither the EU and Türkiye institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein. Responsibility of the contents belong to the authors of EU Beyond the Limits Project team members mentioned below

Editorial

Policy

All new manuscripts to ICLEL Conferences should be submitted directly via [iclelchair Online Editorial System](#). By using the online submission system, you can access and process your submitted manuscript(s) from anywhere with internet access, and all the records including the files and the exchange of information will be maintained.

Step 1. To keep scientific integrity, one of our editors will run plagiarism on each new submission to check if it has potential problem of plagiarism. Papers not passing the plagiarism check will be desk separated and rejected immediately.

Step 2. Then the publication Chairs will conduct initial check to ensure the submission falls within the scope of the conference and decide if it merits further review. Once passed the initial check, the manuscript will be assigned to reviewers for double-blind peer review.

Step 3. Each selected submission will be reviewed by at least two or three independent expert reviewers in the field on originality, validity, quality and academic merit, and readability.

Step 4. The peer review reports received from the experts will be judged by one of the editors with international scientific standards.

Step 5. The logical and valid peer review reports will be sent to the authors for them to revise the manuscript accordingly. For invalid reports, the editor may either assign a new reviewer or make a judgement based on his/her own.

Step 6. Authors are required to respond to the peer review comments in details and revise their paper according to the points raised.

Step 7. The revised manuscript will then be evaluated by the editor whether the points raised by the reviewers have been fully addressed or not.

Step 8. Then the editor will send the revised manuscript to the reviewers again for re-evaluation.

Step 9. If all revision will be completed successfully, editor will accept them for publishing.

Step 9. If the reviewers approve the revised version of the manuscript, then the Editor-in-Chief will make a final decision on acceptance for the publication.

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.

