



# Peer-Review Statements

Bambang Sugiharto<sup>1,2(✉)</sup>, Asmoro Lelono<sup>1,3</sup>, Muhammad Akbar Bahar<sup>4,5</sup>,  
Syubanut Wathon<sup>1</sup>, Asep Ginanjar Arip<sup>6</sup>, Kartika Senjarini<sup>1</sup>, Ramdhan Putrasetya<sup>1</sup>,  
Beny Andika<sup>1</sup>, and Nadhea Ayu Sukma<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Biology, Faculty of Mathematic and Natural Sciences, Jember University,  
Jember, East Java, Indonesia

sugiharto.fmipa@unej.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> Centres for Development of Advanced Science and Technology (CDAST), Jember University,  
Jember, East Java, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Behavioural Department, GELIFES Institute, Groningen Universities, Groningen, Netherlands

<sup>4</sup> Pharmacy Faculties, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, South Sulawesi 90245, Indonesia

<sup>5</sup> Institute of Clinical Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

<sup>6</sup> Master of Biology Education, School of Postgraduate Study, Kuningan University, Kuningan,  
West Java, Indonesia

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the International Conference on Life Science and Biotechnology (ICOLIB) on November 15–16, 2021 at Jember University Indonesia. These articles have been peer-reviewed by the members of the Scientific Committee of ICOLIB 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 reviewer(s) independently. The conference submission management system was easy chair.

We divided the submission of the ICOLIB participant into two categories, the first is abstract and the second the full manuscript submission. The submissions of the abstract were first screened for generic quality, relatedness to the main topic and suitability by the editorial team. Based on this initial screening, all of the abstracts would be classified by the main theme, i.e. Applied Sciences (Agriculture, Biotechnology & Bioinformatics), Basic Sciences (Ecology, Zoology, Botany, and Microbiology), Biodiversity & Bioconservation, Health & Medicine (Pharmacy & Medical Sciences). All of the selected abstracts would be presented by their author during the ICOLIB conferences. The committee gave an option to the authors to publish their manuscripts or just presented their work in the ICOLIB conference.

All of the complete manuscripts then follow the review process, the first step was to evaluate the relatedness to the proceedings series “Advances in Biological Sciences Research”, scientific quality, novelty and contribution to the science. The second step is checking the similarity using Turnitin to evaluate the textual overlap and detect the possible sign of plagiarism. The third step was to send for peer review by matching each

---

B. Sugiharto—Editors-in-Chief of the ICOLIB.

© The Author(s) 2023

A. Lelono et al. (Eds.): ICOLIB 2021, ABSR 27, pp. 1–3, 2023.

[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-062-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-062-6_1)

paper's topic with the reviewers' expertise, taking into account any competing interests. However, in some case, we also sent the manuscript to the third reviewer to consider another opinion if the first two reviewers has an opposite decision. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it had received favourable comments and suggestions from the two reviewers. The recommendations then sent back to the author to address the reviewer's comment. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final. In the final steps, all of the manuscripts were adjusted in their layout and some of the technical editing for the pre-print version. This preprint document would be sent to the author for clarification. They also should be sent a statement of the novelty and originality of the study.

## 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. The editorial gave a rubric for a guideline which contains some important aspect related to the quality of the manuscript such as:

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, style, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

We have a policy that each manuscript should be reviewed by two reviewers and each reviewer only reviews two manuscripts. The consequences of this policy is that we contact more reviewers, in total we ask 61 reviewer for completing the review process.

## 3 Key Metrics

Total submissions	118
Number of articles sent for peer review	67
Number of accepted articles	61.
Acceptance rate	51.5%
Number of reviewers	61

## 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.

