



Peer-Review Statements

M. Faruq Ubaidillah^{1*}, Durotun Nasihah², Dzulfikri Dzulfikri³, Febti Ismiatun⁴,
Mochamad Imron Azami⁵

Department of English Education, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia

*Editor-in-Chief of the 5th ICON-ELT 2024. Email: mfubaidillah@unisma.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 5th ICON-ELT 2024 during October 9-10 in Malang, East Java Province, Indonesia. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Board of 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 *double-blind*. Each submission was examined by *two* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Open Conference System.

The manuscripts submitted to this conference were double-blind peer-reviewed by at least 2 (two) reviewers. The accepted manuscripts were recommended for online publication following the conference peer-reviewing process. The language used in this conference is English.

For checking Plagiarism, the 5th ICON-ELT Editor screened plagiarism manually (offline and online database) on the Title, Abstract, and Body Text of the manuscript, and by using Turnitin. If it is found to be a plagiarism indication, the editorial board rejects the manuscript immediately. The following are the submission screening processes.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers were instructed to assess the quality of submissions solely based on the academic merit of their content along the following procedures.

1. Editor received the manuscript from the author;
2. Editor evaluated the manuscript (journal aim and scope, in-house style, supplementary data); (Rejected if not meets criteria)

3. Editor screened for plagiarism on offline and online databases manually; (Rejected if found major plagiarism, contact author if found redundancy or minor plagiarism for clarification). The similarity index is a maximum of 15%.
4. Editor sent the manuscript to the reviewer along with the review form (blind review);
5. Reviewer sent back his review form to Editor (with a revised manuscript if necessary);
6. Editor's decision (rejected, requires major revision, needs minor revision, or accepted);
7. Confirmation to the Author.
8. For any revisions, the author revised the manuscript, and should be returned to the editor without delay. Returned later than one month will be considered withdrawn.

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

<i>Total submissions</i>	50
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	35
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	20
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	49%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	5

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.

