

Editorial

This issue of the IJEE has two parts. The first part 33-2(A) includes papers that address various topics in engineering education including: Retention, Gender, Entrepreneurship, Creativity, Motivation, Project-Based Learning, Social Responsibility, Students' Perceptions, Graduate Attributes, Engineering Education Research, Design Education, Spatial Skills, Technology in Education, Low-Cost Laboratories, Industrial Engineering, Computer Engineering, Architecture Design, Communication Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and Chemical Engineering. The authors are from numerous institutions in various countries including: USA, Chile, Japan, China, Israel, Pakistan, Spain, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Canada, and Montenegro.

The second part 33-2(B) includes a special issue on the Engineering Behind Technology-Based Educational Innovations. It is guest-edited by Professors Francisco José García Peñalvo, and Martín Llamas to whom I wish to express my gratitude for the time and effort they devoted to this special issue.

I also wish to thank all the authors for their contributions to this issue of the IJEE and I hope the readers find the issue useful and interesting.

I mentioned in the editorial of issue 33-1 that among the key criteria for considering any manuscript for publication in the IJEE are the soundness of the methodology and the usefulness of the results. The question remained: how many opinions are enough to judge the usefulness of a specific work?

To the best of my knowledge, there is no specific number of opinions that can be cited as the ideal based on concrete scientific evidence. It is, however, customary to consider two or three independent opinions. If there are conflicting reviews, should the status of the submission be based on a simple majority of opinions? One has to be careful, that the review process and the decisions reached do not become a mechanical process based on checkmarks placed in boxes (or equivalent) to satisfy an arbitrary trend, leading to conclusions solely based on some sort of a number or a ratio. One needs to ponder the words attributed to Lily Amis (who is not an engineer, but an independent author who cares about important issues in society): "Authors need readers and not followers. Authors need review and not Likes!"

It may be tempting to think that all reviews are equal, *but some are more equal than others*. One informative review could have more impact and value than three (or even more) ambiguous ones that do not provide logical evidence. A question remains: could a paper reviewed by more than two reviewers still be misjudged?

Ahmad Ibrahim