



Peer-Review Statements

Murhaban Murhaban^{1,*} Rizki Agam Syahputra² Andrisman Satria³ Maskyur Maskyur⁴ Nica Astrianda⁵

¹ Information Technology Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh, Indonesia 1

² Industrial Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh, Indonesia 2

³ Civil Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh, Indonesia 2

⁴ Mechanical Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh, Indonesia 2

⁵ Information Technology Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh, Indonesia 2

*Editor-in-Chief of the AESTI 2025. Email: murhaban@utu.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 3rd International Conference on Applied Engineering, Sciences, Technology and Innovation (AESTI) during October 20th 2025 in The City of Meulaboh, Indonesia. 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 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Microsoft Conference Management Toolkit (CMT)

Initially, submissions were assessed for general quality and appropriateness. Paper that passed this preliminary screening were then forwarded for peer review, where each paper was matched with reviewers based on their areas of expertise, while also considering any potential conflicts of interest. A paper could be considered for acceptance only if it received positive assessments from both 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.

The submissions were first screened for general quality and suitability. After this initial screening, the remaining papers were sent for peer review by matching each paper's topic with the reviewers' expertise, while also taking into account any competing interests. To improve the integrity of the review process, several measures were implemented. For instance, reviewers were recused from handling papers authored by closely related colleagues or collaborators, and steps were taken to reduce unconscious bias, such as using double-anonymized review where feasible and providing reviewers with bias-awareness training. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it received favourable recommendations from both reviewers.

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. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results – Most critical because flawed methodology invalidates any claims, regardless of novelty or clarity.
- 2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research – Essential for contributing new knowledge to the field.
- 3. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field – Non-negotiable, though typically less variable than scientific validity.
- 4. Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference – Important for fit, but a strong paper can sometimes be redirected to another venue.

Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression – Necessary for communication, but usually fixable during revision. 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 conference uses Turnitin to screen all submissions for text similarity, improper paraphrasing, and self-plagiarism; any detected cases are flagged for further investigation and may lead to immediate rejection.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	21
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	20
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	14
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	70%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	22

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.

