Peer-Review Statements

Rohana Abdul Rahman[1*], Mohamad Fateh Labanieh[2] Md. Zahurul Haq [2], Zuryati Mohamed Yusoff [4], Ahmad Shamsul Abd. Aziz [5]

[1,2,3,4,5] School of Law, Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM)

[*]Editor-in-Chief of the [UUMILC 2023]. Email: hana@uum.edu.my

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the UUMILC 2023 during 23-24 August 2023 in virtual form. These articles have been peer reviewed by reviewers assigned by the two Committees, International Editorial Committee and the Conference Paper Publication and Parallel Sessions 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 Two (2) reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was OpenConf Peer Review and Submission Management System.

The submissions were first screened 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.

In the process of conducting our peer review, we have adhered stringently to protocols designed to mitigate unconscious bias and enhance the integrity of our recusal procedures. Recognizing the profound impact that unconscious biases can have on the objectivity of the review, we have implemented rigorous measures to identify and address these biases, ensuring that each submission is evaluated solely on the merits of its content.

Furthermore, we have established and enforced comprehensive recusal protocols. These protocols obligate reviewers to abstain from assessing submissions from authors

with whom they share close personal or professional relationships. This policy is critical in safeguarding against potential conflicts of interest, thereby upholding the credibility and impartiality of the review process. By rigorously adhering to these procedures, we strive to maintain the highest standards of integrity and fairness in our peer review system

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:

As the Chief Editor overseeing the review process for our conference, I would instruct the reviewers to adhere to the following quality criteria in their evaluations:

1. Ensure that each submission is closely aligned with the conference's thematic focus. Papers should contribute meaningfully to the overarching topics and discussions of the conference.

2. Evaluate the extent to which the work presents new ideas, methodologies, or insights. The submission should demonstrate a clear advancement or a novel approach in its field.

3. Assess the robustness and appropriateness of the methodology employed. The methods should be well-defined, appropriate for the research questions posed, and executed with precision.

4. The paper should be well-organized, with a clear structure, logical flow of ideas, and coherent argumentation. It should be easily understandable to the audience of the conference.

5. Review the theoretical grounding and empirical evidence provided. The arguments should be well-supported by relevant literature or data.

6. Consider the potential impact of the research. Determine if the findings have significant implications for the field, practice, policy, or further research.

7. Assess whether the study provides sufficient detail for replication and transparency in its processes and analyses.

In addition, all the articles have been checked for textual overlap to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. This is achieved through using Turnitin software.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	56
Number of articles sent for peer review	45
Number of accepted articles	31
Acceptance rate	55.35%
Number of reviewers	53

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Some of the authors (Mohamad Fateh Labanieh, Zuryati Mohamed Yusoff, Ahmad Shamsul Abd. Aziz, Anis Najihah Mazlan) were supervised by the Editor-in-Chief, who has recused herself from handling their submissions and has delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.