



# Peer-Review Statements

Gani Nur Pramudyo<sup>1,\*</sup>, Izmy Khumairoh<sup>2</sup>, Marta Widayawati<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University, Semarang 50275, Indonesia

\*Editor-in-Chief of the ICOCAS 2024. Email: [gani@live.undip.ac.id](mailto:gani@live.undip.ac.id)

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at The 2nd International Conference on Culture and Sustainable Development (ICOCAS) 2024 during 6-7 August 2024 in Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Scientific 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 single-blind. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewer(s) independently. The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. 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.

The reviewer sends the review back to the editor with a recommendation to accept, reject, or request revision. Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The editor considers all returned reviews before making an overall decision. If the reviews are very different, the editor may invite additional reviewers for additional opinions. After the manuscript is revised, the editor reviews it again and decides to accept it. The accepted article is then sent to the copyeditor for final checks.

To prevent bias in the reviewing process, reviewers takes several steps: 1) Aware of stereotypes related to race, gender, culture, and other characteristics. They should avoid making judgments based on these stereotypes, such as assuming a paper needs editing by a native English speaker simply because the author may not have English as their first language; 2) Focus on the content of the manuscript rather than making assumptions based on author characteristics or affiliations; 3) Disclose any potential or actual conflicts of interest to the editors; 4) Provide specific feedback on gaps or areas

© The Author(s) 2024

G. Nur Pramudyo et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Culture and Sustainable Development (ICOCAS 2024)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 872,

[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-313-9\\_1](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-313-9_1)

for improvement, using benchmarks to explain their assessments; 5) Provide specific feedback on gaps or areas for improvement, using benchmarks to explain their assessments; and 6) Familiarize themselves with the journal's scope, aims, policies, and guidelines.

Editors also have clear policies and guidelines in place to address bias. They should reserve the right to edit or reject biased reviews and remove biased reviewers from future consideration. By following these steps, reviewers significantly may reduce the likelihood of bias in the reviewing process, ensuring that their evaluations are fair, honest, and constructive.

## **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;
3. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
4. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.
5. Accuracy of the research method;
6. Depth of discussion;
7. Quality of conclusion;
8. Use of literature;
9. Logical coherence, structure, and legibility;
10. Presentation of data;
11. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. Start by reading the entire article to identify any text that seems inconsistent with the rest of the article in terms of tone, structure, and choice of words. Look for obvious grammatical mistakes, typos, or different fonts that may indicate plagiarism. Beside of that, reviewers and editors employ plagiarism detection software to check for text similarities. We used Turnitin to help identify plagiarism by comparing the manuscript with a vast database of written content.

### 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	102
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	85
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	51
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	61,17 %
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	7

### 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.

