Peer-Review Statements

Aswi Aswi [1,*], Nurwati Djam'an [2] Muhammad Isbar Pratama [3], Muhammad Ikram [4]

[1,2,3,4] Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia.

[*] Editor-in-Chief of the 2nd ICSTE 2024. Email: aswi@unm.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 2nd ICSTE during September 6, 2024, in Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar City, Indonesia. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Reviewers 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 two reviewers independently. The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitableness. After the initial screening, 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.

Papers are considered acceptable once both reviewers provide positive evaluations. Following this, the authors receive the reviewers' feedback form. They are instructed to address the reviewers' comments thoroughly. The revised manuscript is then returned to the reviewers to confirm whether the comments have been adequately addressed. If any concerns remain unresolved, the manuscript is sent back to the authors for further revisions. The final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of the revised manuscript is definitive. Additionally, the Editorial Board reviews accepted papers to correct minor errors in punctuation, grammar, and formatting.

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.

A. Aswi et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sciences, Technology and Education (ICSTE 2024)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 898,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-335-1_1

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.

The evaluation criteria are outlined in the review report form as follows:

No	Evaluation Criteria 5 (Excellent), 4 (Good), 3(Average), 2 (below Average), 1 (Poor)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1	Alignment with the conference sub-themes						
2	Quality of English language usage						
3	Appropriateness and sufficiency of key-words/key phrases						
4	The introduction provides sufficient background and includes all relevant references						
5	Appropriateness of the research design						
6	Adequacy of the description of methods						
7	Clarity in the presentation of results						
8	Support for conclusions based on the results						
9	Originality/Novelty of the research						
10	Relevance and clarity of illustrations, graphs, and tables						
11	Adequacy and accuracy of the reference list						

Please provide specific reviewer comments to be shared with the Paper Reviewer Coordinator, including recommendations. Expand on any areas of strength or weakness identified in the checklist above

What is your overall recommendation regarding the paper? Please select one option

- ☐ Accept as is
- ☐ Accept with minor revisions (the reviewer does not wish to review the manuscript again)

- ☐ Reconsider after major revisions – uncertain (it is unclear if the necessary revisions can be adequately made, but the author should be given the opportunity to attempt them)
- ☐ Reject.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. All papers undergo a similarity check, and only those with a similarity score below 20% are accepted.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	114
Number of articles sent for peer review	56
Number of accepted articles	18
Acceptance rate	16%
Number of reviewers	10

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest.