



# Peer-Review Statements

Dian Bayu Firmansyah<sup>(✉)</sup>, Usep Muttaqin, Ambhita Dhyaningrum,  
and Tri Wahyu Setiawan Prasetyoningsih

Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Banyumas, Indonesia  
dbayuf@unsoed.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the Academia Based Tourism Revival during September 27–29, 2022 in Purwokerto, Indonesia (Online). 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 double-blind review. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Open Journal System.

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.

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.

Any selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process. Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor. Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

---

D. B. Firmansyah—Editor-in-Chief of the ABTR.

© The Author(s) 2023

D. B. Firmansyah et al. (Eds.): ABTR 2022, ASSEHR 738, pp. 1–3, 2023.

[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-028-2\\_1](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-028-2_1)

## 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.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. Editors recognizes that plagiarism is not acceptable and therefore establishes the following policy stating specific actions (penalties) upon identification of plagiarism/similarities in articles submitted for publication in proceeding of ABTR. ABTR editors used Turnitin's originality checking software as the tool in detecting similarities of texts in article manuscripts and the final version articles ready for publication.

## 3 Key Metrics

<i>Total submissions</i>	80
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	72
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	22
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	30.5%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	15

**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.

