Peer-Review Statements

Rohmani Nur Indah[1(✉)], Miftahul Huda[2], Irham Irham[3], Muzakki Afifuddin[1],
Masrokhin Masrokhin[4], and Deny Efita Nur Rakhmawati[1]

[1] Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Malang, Indonesia
`indah@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id`
[2] University of Antwerp, Atwerpen, Belgium
[3] Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei
[4] Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the hybrid conference of AICOLLOM 2022 during 21-22 September 2022 in Humanities Faculty of Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia that was also conducted online through Zoom meeting. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the scientific committee of AICOLLIM 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 two reviewer(s) independently.

Only the submissions whose similarity index were lower than 15% were accepted and first screened by editors for generic quality and suitableness. 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. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

Reviewers should not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript, including junior researchers they are mentoring, without first obtaining permission from editor-in-chief; the names of any individuals who have helped them with the review should be included with the returned review so that they are associated with the manuscript in the proceeding's records and can also receive due credit for their efforts.

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

---

R. N. Indah—Editor-in-Chief of the AICOLLIM 2022.

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.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. We declare that authors should check similarity index of all manuscript in relevant database before submitting their papers and make sure that it is below 15%

3 Key Metrics

Total submissions	105
Number of articles sent for peer review	80
Number of accepted articles	62
Acceptance rate	59%
Number of reviewers	13

Competing Interests. Peer reviewers should guarantee that their review is based on the merits of the work and not influenced, either positively or negatively, by any personal, financial, or other conflicting considerations or by intellectual biases.

In addition to this, reviewers should be specific in their criticisms, and provide evidence with appropriate references to substantiate general statements such as, 'this work has been done before', to help editors in their evaluation and decision and in fairness to the authors.