



Peer-Review Statements

Hanifah Widiastuti, Tiwi Gustria Ningsih, Agung Riyadi, Abdurahman Dwijotomo, and Didi Istardi ^{1,*}

¹ Politeknik Negeri Batam, Indonesia

*Editor-in-Chief of the The 8th ICAE 2025. Email: istardi@polibatam.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the The 8th The International Conference on Applied Engineering 2025 (ICAE 2025) during 30 – 31 October 2025 in Batam, Indonesia. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Technical program Chair of the conference 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 review process for ICAE 2025 was conducted using a rigorous double-blind review methodology to ensure impartiality and fairness. In this process, the identities of both authors and reviewers were concealed from each other throughout the evaluation period.

The conference utilized the EDAS (Event Data Administration System) as the submission management platform.

Initial Screening: Upon submission, all manuscripts underwent an initial screening by the Editorial Committee to assess their general quality, adherence to formatting guidelines, and relevance to the conference scope. Submissions that did not meet the basic requirements or fell outside the conference themes were desk-rejected at this stage.

Peer Review Assignment: Manuscripts that passed the initial screening were assigned to at least two independent reviewers. The assignment process carefully matched each paper's topic and methodology with reviewers' areas of expertise and research interests. Any potential conflicts of interest, including institutional affiliations, prior collaborations, or professional relationships, were identified and avoided during the assignment process.

Independent Evaluation: Each reviewer independently evaluated the assigned manuscripts using standardized criteria (detailed in Section 2). Reviewers provided detailed feedback, ratings,

and recommendations (accept, minor revision, major revision, or reject) through the EDAS platform.

Editorial Decision: Papers could only be considered for acceptance if they received favorable recommendations from both reviewers. In cases where reviewers' recommendations diverged significantly, the Editor-in-Chief or designated Associate Editors reviewed the submission and comments to make a final determination.

Revision Opportunity: Authors of papers requiring revisions were provided with comprehensive reviewer feedback and given a specific timeframe to revise and resubmit their manuscripts. Revised submissions were re-evaluated to ensure that authors had adequately addressed all reviewer comments and concerns.

Final Decision: The acceptance or rejection of revised manuscripts was final and communicated to authors through the EDAS system. Accepted papers were then prepared for inclusion in the conference proceedings.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers were provided with comprehensive guidelines to assess the quality of submissions objectively and consistently. Each manuscript was evaluated solely based on its academic merit across the following key dimensions:

1. Relevance and Scope

- Alignment of the article's content with the conference themes and scope
- Significance and timeliness of the research topic within the field of applied engineering
- Potential contribution to the conference's interdisciplinary objectives

2. Originality and Innovation

- Clear demonstration of novelty and original contribution to the field
- Distinction from existing literature and prior work
- Innovation in methodology, approach, or application
- Proper acknowledgment and citation of related previous research

3. Methodological Rigor

- Soundness and appropriateness of research methods and experimental design
- Validity and reliability of data collection and analysis procedures
- Sufficiency of evidence to support conclusions
- Appropriate use of statistical or analytical techniques

- Reproducibility of results

4. Quality of Results and Discussion

- Clarity and accuracy in presentation of findings
- Depth of analysis and interpretation of results
- Logical connection between objectives, methods, results, and conclusions
- Acknowledgment of limitations and potential biases
- Discussion of implications and practical applications

5. Ethical Standards

- Adherence to ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field
- Proper handling of human subjects, animal welfare, or environmental considerations where applicable
- Transparency in reporting funding sources and potential conflicts of interest
- Compliance with data privacy and protection regulations

6. Presentation Quality and Format Compliance

- Clarity, cohesion, and logical organization of content
- Accuracy and appropriateness of language (grammar, terminology, style)
- Quality and clarity of figures, tables, and other visual elements
- Adherence to the conference template and formatting specifications
- Compliance with page limits, font requirements, and margin specifications
- Proper formatting of references and citations according to conference style guidelines
- Appropriate section structure (abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion)
- Completeness and accuracy of metadata (title, author information, affiliations, keywords)

Plagiarism Detection: In addition to the peer review evaluation, all accepted articles underwent automated plagiarism detection screening using specialized software to check for textual overlap with published works. This process was conducted by the publisher to ensure the originality and integrity of all content included in the conference proceedings.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	74
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	67
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	37
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	50%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	13

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

The organizing committee and editorial team have maintained strict ethical standards throughout the review process to ensure fairness and objectivity. Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest that could have influenced the review and selection of articles for this proceedings volume.

To maintain the integrity of the peer-review process, appropriate measures were taken to manage any potential conflicts of interest. In cases where authors had prior academic or professional relationships with members of the editorial team, those editors recused themselves from handling the respective submissions and delegated the review process to independent colleagues with no personal or professional interests in the outcomes.

All reviewers were required to declare any potential conflicts of interest before accepting review assignments, and papers were reassigned when necessary to ensure unbiased evaluation.

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.

