



Peer-Review Statements

Unung Verawardina¹(✉) and Akrimullah Mubai²

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia
ambiyar@ft.unp.ac.id

² Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [10 Th” INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING (ICTVET)] during [“August 26, 2023”] in [Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang]. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Padang] 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.

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

The system for receiving, selecting and reviewing manuscripts is as follows:

1. The author sends the article in abstract and full paper form.
2. Authors must follow the article template available at <https://ictvetftunp.web.id/2023>
3. Article writing plagiarism 20%
4. After the author sends the article there is confirmation that the article has been uploaded to the website.
5. The article selection process is carried out by the editor and guest editor, then the editor will check the article for plagiarism of a maximum of 20%. For articles that meet the plagiarism criteria of less than 20%, the editor will distribute them to domestic and international reviewers, national and international reviewers.
6. Then the review process is carried out twice (national and international reviewers), the results of the review are sent back to the author and the author makes revisions, and is reviewed again by the reviewer and the author revises again, in the final stage the editor and guest editor select the articles that are accepted.
7. Determination of articles accepted and granted LOA.
8. On accepted articles, copy editing will be carried out according to the layout.
9. Confirm the article with the author before publication.
10. Evaluation is carried out by the evaluation committee to double check the articles received and those to be published until they comply with the format.
11. 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. Not plagiarized and original
3. Suitability of methods, results and analysis
4. Accuracy of content
5. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
6. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.
7. Article quality

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]*

3 KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	103
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	70
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	16
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	22%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	12

[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.

[This international conference activity was supported by conference costs from DRTPM grant funds]

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.

