

Peer-Review Statements

Mohammad Zakki Azani*¹ Syamsul Hidayat,² Triono Ali Mustofa,² Mohamad Ali³

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta

² Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta

³ Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta

**Editors-in-Chief of the [ICIMS2021]. Email: m.zakkiazani@ums.ac.id, sh282@ums.ac.id, ma122@ums.ac.id, tam763@ums.ac.id*

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the International Conference on Islamic and Muhammadiyah Studies or ICIMS2021 during 14-15 January 2022 in Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Track Directors and their members 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 reviewers independently.

The conference submission management system was Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence.

The submissions were first screened by the Track Directors 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.

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. Reviewers were given an article and revise it accordingly the acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final. To avoid unconscious bias, the Track Directors selected the reviewers according with their areas of expertise and then the article that need to be revised is given to authors with anonymous reviewer. Moreover, based on the referees' comments, the Track Directors make a final decision on the acceptability of the manuscript and communicates to the authors the decision, along with referees' reports. The status reports to reviewers should identify the reviewers of each paper, the final decision can be "Accept Submission", "Revisions Required", or "Decline Submission." The revised version should be submitted considering the review comments.

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. 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.
6. The authors should make sure that the manuscript passes a criterion of maximum 20 % similarities to other publications.

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>	152
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	99
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	44
	28,94%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	18

Editor in-Chief and the team have selected 44 articles to be published in Atlantis Press and the rest of them were published in our own university journal (national journal).

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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

Some of the authors Ainurrohmah Urbaningrum and Dwi Yulia Ulfiani were supervised by the Editor-in-Chief, who have recused themselves from handling their submissions and has delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.