Peer-Review Statements

Che Yee Lye[1,*] Lyndon Lim[1,2,] Quan Zhang[3]

[1] Teaching & Learning Centre, Singapore University of Social Sciences
[2] Graduate School of Education, The University of Western Australia
[3] City University of Macau, SAR China

[*]Editor-in-Chief of the PROMS 2025. Email: cylye@suss.edu.sg

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the Pacific Rim Objective Measurement Symposium 2025 during 21-23 July 2025 in Singapore. These articles have been peer reviewed by the Editorial members and anonymous reviewers, and approved by the Editor-in-Chief and co-Editors, who affirms that this document is a truthful description of the conference's review process.

1. REVIEW PROCEDURE

The reviews were double-blind, professional and rigorous. Each submission was examined by two reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Meteor (Springer Nature) only. The overall process of review for this conference proceedings goes as follows:

1.1 OSS and HSSS

All submissions were initially screened for textual similarity using the overall similarity score (OSS) and highest score from single source (HSSS), as automatically generated by the Springer Nature editorial system. Both the OSS and HSSS were required to remain below 25%. Submissions with either an OSS or HSSS exceeding this threshold were returned to the authors for revision. This screening process helped ensure that manuscripts selected for publication demonstrated an acceptable level of originality and did not contain excessive textual overlap with previously published sources.

1.2 Quality and Relevance

Following the initial OSS and HSSS screening, submissions were assessed for general quality and suitability for inclusion in the proceedings. Each manuscript was then sent for peer review, with reviewers selected by matching the topic of the submission to

© The Author(s) 2026
C. Y. Lye et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Pacific Rim Objective Measurement Symposium (PROMS 2025)*,
Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 56,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-834-4_1

their relevant areas of expertise while taking into account any potential competing interests. A manuscript was considered for acceptance only when it received favourable recommendations from two reviewers. In cases where the two reviewers provided differing recommendations, a third reviewer was invited to provide an additional assessment to inform the final decision.

1.3 Non-Submission and Rejection

- Authors who did not submit their manuscripts by the stipulated deadline were not considered for publication.
- Authors who did not submit a revised version by the stipulated deadline were not permitted to proceed further for publication.
- For manuscripts that received a final rejection decision, authors were not given a further opportunity to revise and resubmit the manuscript in response to the reviewers' comments. The decision to accept or reject a revised manuscript was final.

1.4 Efforts to Enhance the Peer Review Process

- The editorial board reserved the right to invite external reviewers. Reviewers' identities were kept anonymous to authors throughout the review process.
- Reviewers were selected based on the alignment between their areas of expertise and the subject matter of the manuscripts, while potential competing interests were taken into consideration to ensure a fair and credible review process.

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. 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.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	39
Number of articles sent for peer review	33
Number of accepted articles	26
Acceptance rate	67%
Number of reviewers	17
Keynote papers	5
Special reports	2
Instrument and assessment development and validation articles	8
Rater-mediated assessment and MFRM articles	3
AI and emerging applications of Rasch measurement articles	3
Rasch measurement across disciplinary contexts articles	5

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

The Editors and the PROMS 2025 Organising Committee hereby declare that no competing interests in relation to the preparation, editing and publication of the PROMS 2025 Conference Proceedings. PROMS is an independent academic symposium dedicated to Rasch measurement or Rasch-based research. The organisation, editorial process and publication of the Proceedings were conducted independently and were not influenced by any commercial interests.

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.

