



# Peer-Review Statements

Harun Joko Prayitno<sup>(✉)</sup>, Yasir Sidiq, and Naufal Ishartono

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta,  
Indonesia  
alptkptm@gmail.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [*International on Education for All*] during [*on 19 August 2023*] in [*Malaysia*]. 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 [*single-blind*]. Each submission was examined by [*2*] reviewer(s) independently.

[*The conference submission management system was <https://iceduall.alptkptm.org/submit/>*]

[*Please describe the overall process of review for your conference. Example text: 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.]

[*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.*]

## 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;

H. J. Prayitno—Editor-in-Chief of the [ICEDUALL].

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. *[The accepted manuscripts have successfully undergone a similarity test with results showing a similarity score below 25% when analyzed using a similarity checker application. This indicates that the manuscripts have met the criteria for originality and have not been extensively copied from other sources, aligning with the principles of academic integrity. Ensuring that scholarly works, such as research manuscripts, pass similarity tests and avoid plagiarism is imperative in maintaining the standards of academic writing.]*

### 3 KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	67
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	52
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	29
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	43%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	20

*[Any additional information about article statistics belongs to this section, but the listing should suffice in most situations. More rows can be added if necessary, but please do not delete any existing row. Numbers are for example only. "Acceptance rate" is (number of accepted articles) divided by (number of total submissions).]*

### 4 COMPETING INTERESTS

*[Competing interests refer to any interests of the Editor-in-Chief and/or members of the review body, that may or may be perceived to influence editorial decisions. It is normal to have interests, even competing ones, but the ethics of scientific publication demands that any competing interests be properly declared, and that appropriate steps be taken to uphold the validity of the editorial process in their presence.]*

*This is the proper section to document competing interests and the measures to address them. We show three examples here, and we encourage the organizers consult the Publisher's and/or COPE guidelines for further information. In case of uncertainty, please contact the Publisher.*

*Example A (for no special interest):* 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.

