



## Peer-Review Statements

Edy Lisdyono<sup>1</sup>, Ade Saptomo<sup>2</sup>, Faisal Santiago<sup>3</sup>, I Nyoman Budiarta<sup>4</sup>, Ahmad Sudiro<sup>5</sup>, Zaenal Arifin Hoesein<sup>6</sup>, Laksanto Laksanto<sup>7</sup>, Wasis Susetio<sup>8\*</sup>, Zulfikar Judge<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PASQAPRO

<sup>2</sup>PASQAPRO

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Law, Borobudur University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Faculty of Law, Warmadewa University, Denpasar, Indonesia

<sup>5</sup>Faculty of Law, Tarumanagara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Banten, Indonesia

<sup>7</sup>Faculty of Law, Tarumanagara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

<sup>8</sup>PASQAPRO

<sup>9</sup>Faculty of Law, Esa Unggul University, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Wasis Susetio [ICOCLB 2024]. Email: wasis.susetio@esaunggul.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the ICOCLB 2024 during 27 April 2024 in Palembang Youth Pledge College of Law (STIHPADA), Indonesian and on 20 May 2024 in Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Malaysia. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Technical/Scientific Committee Members 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 2 (two) reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Open Conference System.

In a single-blind review process, authors submit their papers, which are then screened for basic quality and relevance by the program committee. Reviewers, who remain anonymous to the authors, are assigned based on expertise and evaluate the paper on criteria such as originality, methodology, and clarity. They provide feedback and recommendations (accept, reject, or revise), which are considered by the program chairs or committee. If revisions are requested, authors make necessary changes and resubmit the paper, often undergoing a secondary review. The final decision, based on the revised submission, determines whether the paper is accepted or rejected, and accepted papers are included in the conference proceedings.

In the single-blind review process, efforts to improve the integrity and fairness of the peer review process are actively implemented. Reviewers are carefully selected to avoid conflicts of interest, and those with close personal or professional relationships with the authors are recused from handling those papers. To mitigate unconscious bias, the conference may provide reviewers with guidelines on how to assess papers objectively, focusing solely on the quality and relevance of the research. Additionally, training or awareness initiatives on bias reduction are often offered to reviewers, encouraging them to evaluate papers based on merit rather than any external factors such as the author's identity, institution, or previous work. These steps are designed to ensure a fairer and more transparent review process.

## 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. Originality and Contribution to the Field – The extent to which the paper presents novel ideas, insights, or findings that contribute meaningfully to the field of study.
2. Relevance and Alignment with Conference Theme – How well the submission aligns with the conference's focus and addresses current trends or critical issues in the discipline.
3. Clarity and Organization – The clarity of the writing, logical flow, and coherence of the argument or research narrative, making it accessible to the intended academic audience.
4. Methodological Rigor – The appropriateness and robustness of the research design, methods, data collection, and analysis in addressing the research questions.
5. Significance and Impact – The potential impact of the research on the field, its practical applications, or implications for future work.
6. Quality of Writing and Presentation – The professionalism of the writing, including grammar, spelling, and adherence to formatting guidelines.
7. References and Literature Review – The depth and relevance of the literature review, as well as the proper citation and engagement with key works in the field.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher.

## 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	120
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	113

<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	55
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	48,6%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	16

#### 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.

