



# Peer-Review Statements

Johan Sukweenadhi<sup>1,\*</sup> Finna Setiawan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Biotechnology, University of Surabaya, Surabaya 60293, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Surabaya, Surabaya 60293, Indonesia

\*Editor-in-Chief of the NRLS 2022. Email: [sukwee@staff.ubaya.ac.id](mailto:sukwee@staff.ubaya.ac.id)

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Natural Resources and Life Sciences (NRLS) 2022 during 24-26<sup>th</sup> August, 2023 in University of Surabaya (2 days online seminar and 1 day onsite workshop). 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. Each submission was examined by at least 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Digiseminar.id (third party). All the process starting from registration, publication material submission period, payment and payment check, presentation and attendance list, reviewer assessment, to certificate issuance; all using that interface. Link: NRLS 2022

The reviewing process began with an initial assessment of submissions to ensure general quality and appropriateness. Subsequently, papers were subjected to peer review, where each submission was matched with reviewers possessing expertise in the respective topic, and potential conflicts of interest were taken into consideration. Approval from both reviewers was necessary for a paper to be considered for acceptance.

For submissions that were initially rejected, authors were offered the chance to revise and resubmit after incorporating feedback from the reviewers. The decision on the acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was conclusive.

The process followed by proofreading and plagiarism checking to sharpen the manuscript quality.

Efforts to enhance the peer review process are integral to maintaining the integrity and quality of scholarly work. As a reviewer, I acknowledge the importance of transparency, fairness, and minimizing biases in the evaluation of submitted manuscripts. Here are some key considerations regarding the improvement of peer review:

**Recusal Procedures:**

- In instances where I am closely related to the authors or have a potential conflict of interest, a robust recusal procedure is in place. This ensures that impartiality is maintained, and the review process remains objective.
- Clear guidelines are provided on situations that warrant recusal, and mechanisms are in place to promptly identify and address any conflicts that may arise during the review process.

**Reducing Unconscious Bias:**

- Efforts to minimize unconscious bias are actively implemented in the review process. This includes ongoing training and awareness programs for reviewers to recognize and address any potential biases that may affect their evaluations.
- Anonymous or blinded review practices are encouraged whenever possible, shielding reviewers from information that could introduce unintended biases.

**Diversity and Inclusivity:**

- Steps are taken to ensure diversity among the pool of reviewers. Emphasizing diversity contributes to a broader range of perspectives in the evaluation process, reducing the impact of singular biases.
- Encouraging participation from reviewers with diverse backgrounds, affiliations, and experiences fosters a more inclusive and comprehensive assessment of submitted manuscripts.

**Feedback and Continuous Improvement:**

- A feedback loop is established, allowing reviewers to provide constructive feedback on the peer review process itself. This includes suggestions for improvements in communication, efficiency, and overall experience.
- Regular assessments and revisions of peer review guidelines are conducted based on feedback from reviewers, authors, and editors, ensuring the continuous improvement of the peer review system.
- By consistently implementing these measures, the peer review process can evolve to meet the ever-changing landscape of scholarly publishing, fostering a more transparent, unbiased, and constructive environment for the evaluation of academic work.

## 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;

Reviewers assess whether the content of the article aligns with the overarching themes and focus areas defined by the conference. The relevance of the research to the conference's scope is crucial for ensuring that it contributes meaningfully to the field of discussion.

2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;

Reviewers evaluate the extent to which the article presents original and novel contributions to the field. They assess the uniqueness of the research and its potential to advance existing knowledge. Timeliness is also considered to ensure that the research addresses current issues or gaps in the field.

3. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;

Reviewers scrutinize the methodology employed in the research, assessing its appropriateness and robustness. They evaluate the clarity of the experimental design, the validity of the analyses conducted, and the reliability of the results. Rigorous and well-justified methods are essential for the credibility of the research.

4. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;

Reviewers examine whether the research adheres to ethical standards and follows established codes of conduct within the specific research field. This includes considerations such as proper handling of data, appropriate citation practices, and ethical treatment of human or animal subjects if applicable.

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

Reviewers assess the clarity and coherence of the article's language, ensuring that it is accessible to the intended audience. They also evaluate the accuracy of the information presented, including data in figures and tables. Well-organized and transparent presentation of results contributes to the overall quality of the manuscript.

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 use the Turnitin with the similarity acceptance below or equal 20%.

### 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	49
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	49
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	21
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	42.8%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	12

### 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.

