Peer-Review Statements

Quan Zhang[1,*]

[1] Jiaxing University, Zhejiang, China/the World Sports University, Macau, SAR, China

[*]Editor-in-Chief of the PROMS. Email: qzhang141@rasch-gz.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the Pacific-Rim Objective Measurement Symposium during the 28th-30th, August, 2023 in Macau, SAR, China. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the PROMS Board and other invited external reviewers 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 professional, double-blind and rigorous. Each submission was examined by two reviewers independently.

All the conference submission management system was EquinOCS/Easychair only. The overall process of review for this conference proceedings goes as follows.

1.1. OSS and HSSS

The submissions were first screened by both o**verall similarity score** (OSS) and h**ighest score from single source** (HSSS) automatically generated by the Springer editorial system. Both OSS and HSSS inherent in any submission were well controlled under 25%. Submissions with either OSS or HSSS found above 25% were returned for revision. This guarantees all the submissions we selected for publication are original papers.

1.2. Quality and Suitableness

After the initial OSS and HSSS screening, the submissions were screened for generic quality and suitableness. 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. In some cases, two reviewers had different opinions, and a third reviewer was invited to make comments and decision.

1.3. Failure and Reject

Q. Zhang (ed.), *Proceedings of the Pacific-Rim Objective Measurement Symposium (PROMS 2023)*,
Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 23,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-494-5_1

(1) Authors who failed to submit their articles by the deadline were not accepted for publication;

(2) Authors who failed to submit their revised version by the deadline were not given the opportunity to proceed further for publication;

(3) Authors of a finally rejected submission were not given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

1.4. **Efforts made in improving peer review**

(1) The editorial board reserves the right to invite external reviewers, and all the reviews were conducted anonymously;
(2) Cross-review principle was adopted to greatly reduce unconscious bias and to appropriately handle paper review by closely related authors or supervisors; for example, Chinese professionals review foreign manuscripts and vice versa.
(3) On the whole, this is a large-scale international review. The invited Chinese professionals come from different parts of China and the manuscripts submitted by authors are from Pacific-rim regions and countries. The chance for a Chinese professor or a foreign expert to accidentally review a paper by their closely related counterpart or a student remains extremely slim. What's more, no authors' info whatever was given in the paper; therefore, in this sense, each review is objective, and hence reliable.

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

2.1. Original submissions

2.1.1. The HSSS inherent in all the articles is kept well under 20% in an effort to ensure no obvious plagiarism by the publisher.

2.1.2. Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of PROMS conference;

2.1.3. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of Rasch Model, or Rasch-based, or Rasch-related research;

2.1.4. Comments on the impact and strengths of the study in the Rasch research field;

2.1.5. Specific recommendations for revisions.

2.2. Resubmissions

Reviewing of the resubmission is based on the above five points (2.1.1.-2.1.5). Reviewers are expected to check and include in the critique comments on the extent of, satisfaction towards the issues raised in the previous review being addressed.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	45
Number of articles sent for peer review	42
Number of accepted articles	32
Acceptance rate	71%
Rasch and scale articles (including keynotes)	*19*
Rasch and testing articles	*4*
Teaching and learning articles	*8*
A special report	*1*

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

The Editor(s) and PROMS organizers hereby declare that no competing interests whatever were, are and will be working during the editing and publication of PROMS Conference Proceedings because PROMS is the only academic symposium who is devoted to Rasch or Rasch-based research and who is financially supported by any company.