



Peer-Review Statements

Adian Khoironi^{1,*}, Nurjanah Nurjanah², Haikal Haikal³

¹ Faculty of Health Science, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Indonesia

² Faculty of Health Science, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Health Science, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Indonesia

*Editor-in-Chief of the [ISWOPHA]. Email: adian.khoironi@dsn.dinus.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *4th International Seminar and Workshop on Public Health Action (ISWOPHA) 2023* during *25-26 September* in *Semarang City*. 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 *single-blind*. Each submission was examined by *at least 1* reviewer(s) independently.

The review process for submissions will be conducted through the conference submission management system, which can be accessed via the following link: <https://healthscience.dinus.ac.id/category/index.php/iswopha>

The submissions undergo an initial screening process by the scientific committee to evaluate the abstracts based on several criteria: alignment with the themes of ISWOPHA, completeness of content elements in the abstract, depth and scope of the discussion, adequacy, and currency of data/information, and methodology. Upon meeting these criteria, authors are invited to submit full papers. Subsequently, each full paper is assigned to reviewers with expertise relevant to its scope. The acceptance decision is based on the feedback provided by the reviewers.

In addition to the review process described above, our conference implements several measures to enhance the quality and fairness of peer review. Firstly, reviewers are recused from handling papers authored by closely related individuals to minimize potential conflicts of interest and ensure impartial evaluation. This ensures that reviewers can provide unbiased assessments of the submissions.

Moreover, steps are taken to reduce unconscious bias throughout the review process. Reviewers are encouraged to focus solely on the academic merit and relevance of the submissions, disregarding factors such as the author's identity, affiliation, or

background. Additionally, we regularly monitor the review process to identify and address any bias, ensuring fairness and integrity in evaluating submissions. These efforts contribute to maintaining a rigorous and equitable peer review process within our conference.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers were provided with clear instructions to evaluate submissions based solely on their academic merit, emphasizing the following criteria, ordered by importance:

1. **Relevance to Conference Themes:** Reviewers were tasked with assessing the extent to which each submission's content aligns with the conference's scope and themes. Priority was given to submissions that directly addressed the conference's focus areas.
2. **Originality and Timeliness:** Reviewers were asked to evaluate the research's degree of creativity, novelty, and timeliness in each submission. Submissions that offered new insights, addressed current gaps in knowledge or introduced innovative approaches were regarded favorably.
3. **Methodological Soundness:** Reviewers assessed the rigor and soundness of each submission's methods, analyses, and results. Emphasis was placed on the research methodology's validity, reliability, and appropriateness.
4. **Ethical Compliance:** Reviewers evaluated whether submissions adhered to ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field. This included considerations of research integrity, ethical treatment of human or animal subjects, and disclosure of conflicts of interest.
5. **Clarity and Accuracy of Expression:** Reviewers examined the clarity, cohesion, and accuracy of the language used in the submissions, as well as the effectiveness of other modes of expression, such as figures and tables. Submissions were expected to be well-written, organized, and accessible from ambiguities.

Additionally, to prevent and detect plagiarism, all submissions underwent thorough checks by the conference's publisher for textual overlap. Our conference also employed plagiarism detection software and manual screening processes to ensure the integrity of the submissions further. Any suspected plagiarism cases were promptly investigated and addressed according to established procedures, upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and ethical publishing practices.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	141
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	127
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	25
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	19,68%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	11

Review Process Efficiency: With 141 submissions and 11 reviewers, the review process was managed efficiently to handle the substantial volume of submissions. Each reviewer evaluated an average of approximately 12 submissions, ensuring thorough and timely peer review.

Quality Control Measures: Despite the relatively low acceptance rate of 19.68%, it signifies the conference's commitment to upholding rigorous quality standards. The acceptance of 25 articles out of 127 sent for peer review reflects a selective process aimed at maintaining excellence in the content presented at the conference.

Reviewer Expertise: The involvement of 11 reviewers indicates a diverse pool of expertise contributing to the evaluation process. Having reviewers with varied backgrounds and specializations enhances the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of the peer review, ensuring that submissions are evaluated from multiple perspectives.

Reviewer Workload: While each reviewer evaluated approximately 12 submissions, it's essential to consider the workload distribution and the reviewers' capacity to maintain the quality and integrity of their assessments. Efforts were made to balance the workload and give reviewers adequate time and resources to conduct thorough evaluations.

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

In ensuring the integrity and impartiality of our editorial process, we disclose the following competing interests:

Example A: Some members of the review body have academic relationships with authors submitting to this conference. Specifically, specific authors have been supervised by members of the review body. To prevent any potential bias, those members have recused themselves from handling the submissions of their supervisees. Submissions associated with these authors have been delegated to other reviewers who have no personal interests in them.

We adhere to the guidelines provided by the Publisher and the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) to ensure that our editorial process upholds the highest standards of integrity and transparency. If there are any uncertainties or questions regarding competing interests, we encourage authors, reviewers, and organizers to reach out to the Publisher for clarification and guidance.

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.

