

Peer-Review Statements

Prasasto Satwiko^{1,*} Khaerunnisa Khaerunnisa¹ Nimas Sekarlangit¹

¹ Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Editor-in-Chief of International Webinar on Digital Architecture [IWEDA] 2021. Email: amos-s@staff.uajy.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume would have been presented at the International Webinar on Digital Architecture [IWEDA] 2021 during 13 – 14 December 2021 virtually. 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 at least 2 reviewer(s) independently. The conference management system was Konferenzi – Web Systems for Scientific Conference.

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. If necessary, reviewed papers would go to second round of review as they were required to meet the standards of international publication.

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

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:

- Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;
- Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
- Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;

- Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
- Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.
- Contribution to the determined fields of studies.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. The Scientific Committee used Turnitin for the manuscripts' plagiarism check.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	97
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	85
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	58
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	59.8%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	15

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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