Peer-Review Statements

Agung Dwi Bahtiar El Rizaq[1,*] Abd Hannan[2,] Masyithah Mardhatillah[3,] Moh. Syafik[4,] Abdul Wafi[5]

[1,2,3,4,5] Universitas Islam Negeri Madura

[*]Editor-in-Chief of the 9th ICONIS 2025. Email: elrizaq@iainmadura.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 9th International Conference of Islamic Studies *(ICONIS) 2025* during *29-30 July 2025* in *State Islamic University of Madura-Indonesia*. 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 [2] reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was *google form* and *online journal system.*

The review process starts with the author submitting the article on the link provided by the conference, and then the publication chair (editorial) reviews the submitted article to determine further whether the article is acceptable or not (Initial editorial assessment, namely the level of plagiarism and suitability of the article scope). Next, the editor sends the article from the author to two reviewers (each article) for review. Reviewers provide recommendations on whether the article is acceptable or not.

The accepted articles were presented at hybrid conference. Next, the editor sends the final article from the author to two reviewers (each article) for final review. In the final stage, the author sends the revision results according to the reviewer's direction (if it is not according to the reviewer's direction, the article is returned to the author by giving additional time to make corrections). If by the specified time it is not appropriate, the article is rejected.

Authors of a rejected submission were allowed to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

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. Reviewers review articles based on the scope and theme of the conference

2. Reviewers review articles based on the field of science, novelty, and originality of the article

3. Reviewers focus on the scientific context of the article and the suitability of scientific writing (one of which is the obligation to use reference applications for authors)

4. Reviewers assess whether all data has clear sources and display key references

In addition, before submitting articles to editorial reviewers, check the plagiarism rate using Turnitin, with a minimum tolerance limit of 20%. Articles with a plagiarism rate above 20% are returned to the author for revision before being sent to the reviewer.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	175
Number of articles sent for peer review	160
Number of articles presented	80
Number of accepted articles	20
Acceptance rate	11,43%
Number of reviewers	5

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest.