



Peer-Review Statements

Ika Nurlaila¹(✉), Novaria S. D. Panjaitan², Rosantia Sarassari³, Rika Rachmalina⁴, Hayani Anastasia⁴, Yunefit Ulfa⁴, Gurendro Putro⁴, Sela S. Mariya², Anna L. Poetranto², and Rozana I. Agustiya⁴

¹ Research Center for Vaccine and Drugs, The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Bogor, Indonesia

ika.nurlaila@brin.go.id

² Center for Biomedical Research, The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Bogor, Indonesia

³ Eijkman Institute for Molecular Biology, The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Bogor, Indonesia

⁴ Research Center for Public Health and Nutrition, The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Bogor, Indonesia

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the ICHR (International Conference for Health Research) 2022 during 23rd–24th November 2022 virtually by zoom and hosted from Building of Sasana Widya Sarwono, The National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Jalan Gatot Subroto No. 8, Jakarta 10340.

These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Review Board of ICHR 2022 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 at least 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was EDAS (<https://edas.info/index.php?c=29749>).

The submissions started from abstracts upon which we checked on generic quality and fitness to the offered topic range. Abstract submission was facilitated through Google Form. Those who passed the abstract check were requested to submit their full manuscripts via EDAS. These submissions were assessed double blindly by reviewers who were recruited not only from BRIN but also external reviewers as well as overseas reviewers. We based our evaluation merely on the writing quality without setting up any quota per topic. The manuscripts were sent only to the relevant reviewers and to some cases where authors put likely interdisciplinary courses we invited reviewers from different background such as one from Pharmacology and one from Traditional Medicine to tandemly checked on papers which discussed about Natural Product Chemistry, and so forth. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it had received favourable recommendations from the two reviewers and submitted their revision per schedule.

I. Nurlaila—Editor-in-Chief of the ICHR 2022.

© The Author(s) 2023

I. Nurlaila et al. (Eds.): ICHR 2022, AHSR 56, pp. 1–4, 2023.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-112-8_1

Authors of a rejected submission at any step were not given a chance to go on to the next step but they were provided with the Review Results that could be downloaded independently via EDAS. The revision should be addressing properly to the suggestions that had been given by the respective Reviewers. The Reviewers would again check whether or not the authors performed the revision. Failed to do proper revision would result in Rejection at this step. Reviewers provided their final evaluation and recommendation but Editor in Chief surveyed if the assessment was also performed sufficiently. In Final Manuscript check, at least one Reviewer declared that the revision reached satisfaction (at least 70% of the loads given in the Review Manuscript step).

Taking into account that Reviewers were also authors, Editor in Chief assured that manuscripts were only assigned to Reviewers who had no conflict of interest and no part in the pertinent manuscripts. Authors who has passed all steps were requested to confirm their attendance on the days of event. We also run surveillance on the presentation and assured that the presenters, in majority, were the first authors and only few that were presented by the co-authors.

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. Relevance to the offered topic scopes
2. Original article or systematic literature review
3. Novelty being proposed or clarity on delivering ideas
4. Scope of impacts
5. Complexity in orchestrating results and discussion
6. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

Similarity rating was automatically provided by EDAS. We accepted up to 25% of similarity rating. In case that manuscripts received positive appreciation from Reviewers yet demonstrated a high similarity rating, the authors were given with additional times to fix it (to reduce their similarity rating by re-writing).

3 Key Metrics

Abstract submission	219
Number of abstracts that went on to Full manuscript submission	132
Abstract Acceptance Rate	60.27%
Number of Full manuscripts sent for Review Process	101
Number of Full manuscripts went on Final manuscript (post revision)	87

Final manuscript acceptance rate	86.14%
Total Acceptance Rate	39.73%
Number of reviewers	56

4 Competing Interests

We acknowledge that having conflict of interest was unavoidable as the call for papers was announced publicly meaning everyone had equal right to submit and to exhibit the results of their works. It would not be fair if we closed off chances for Committee, Reviewer board members and Editorial members to make their submissions. However, we limited the chances of creating conflict of interests through multi layers of manuscript assessment strategy. We illustrated potential degrees of conflict of interest in ICHR 2022 as below:

1. No conflict of interest at all (Team A): perform assignments as either reviewer or editor but not author
2. Mild potential conflict of interest (Team B): perform assignment as either reviewer or editor yet themselves are co-authors (but not first or corresponding authors)
3. Mild potential conflict of interest (Team C): perform assignment as editor or reviewer for manuscripts that belong to their direct superior
4. Mild potential conflict of interest (Team D): first authors in the manuscript and were assigned as reviewers
5. Mild potential conflicts of interest (Team E): the authors are part or involved in the same projects as the Editor in Chief

We could not avoid potential as described above. However, as we conducted the review process on the basis of double blinded review where authors did not have any idea in whose hands their manuscripts were assigned to, and vice versa. We also cross-reviewed a manuscripts to reviewers who were not in the same department but had string background of knowledge to the assigned manuscripts. We combined assessment results from the two Reviewers before making up decision and held a meeting if we figured out cases that needed in-depth thought prior to saying it was drop or a pick. For example: Paper ABC that discussed about the antioxidant potential of some marine sponges was examined by a reviewer who massively studied marine biology and a reviewer whose chemistry background was strong. These two reviewers did not know each other so that there was no way (so limited way) of compromising decision. In the end, we Editorial Board Members studied again of what manuscripts we were bringing on to the ultimate step (publishing). This allowed those who were in charge in Public Health knew about manuscripts being accepted in Natural Chemistry track and so forth. We put our best efforts to ensure that all submissions were treated fairly based on their overall qualities. And above all, integrity is the uttermost value we adhered in enabling dissemination of scientific reports on health research.

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.

