



Peer-Review Statements

Jafriati Jafriati^{1,*} La Ode Muhamad Sety² Jumakil Jumakil³,
Syawal Kamiluddin Saptaputra⁴

¹⁻⁴ Public Health Study Program, Faculty of Public Health, Halu Oleo University,
Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi, 93231, Indonesia

*Editor-in-Chief of the 2nd HOICPH. Email: jafriati@uho.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the The 2nd Halu Oleo International Conference on Public Health (HOICPH) on September 26 2024 in Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi, 93231, 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 single-blind peer review. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Online Editorial System (Open Journal System).

All submissions underwent an initial screening to ensure relevance, originality, and compliance with the conference's scope and submission guidelines. Following this stage, each paper was assigned to at least two qualified reviewers whose expertise aligned with the paper's subject area. In the single-blind process, reviewers were aware of the authors' identities, but the authors did not know the reviewers' identities. Reviewers evaluated the manuscripts based on quality, novelty, clarity, and contribution to the field, while also disclosing any potential conflicts of interest.

A manuscript was considered for acceptance only if it received favorable recommendations from both reviewers. Authors of papers that were not immediately accepted received detailed feedback and were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit their work. The revised versions were reassessed, and the decision to accept or reject at this stage was final.

To ensure fairness and uphold the integrity of the review process, several measures were implemented. Reviewers were required to declare any potential conflicts of inter-

est and were recused from evaluating submissions authored by colleagues, collaborators, or individuals with whom they had a close professional or personal relationship. Assignments of reviewers to papers were carefully matched based on expertise to improve the quality and relevance of feedback.

Additionally, reviewers were reminded to focus on the scientific merit, originality, and clarity of the work, rather than factors unrelated to the research quality, as part of an effort to minimize unconscious bias. Guidelines and evaluation forms were standardized to help reviewers provide consistent and constructive feedback. These steps were taken to strengthen the credibility, transparency, and fairness of the single-blind peer review process.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers were instructed to evaluate submissions strictly on the basis of their academic merit, using the following criteria in order of importance:

1. **Relevance to Conference Scope and Themes**
The extent to which the paper aligns with the main focus and objectives of the conference.
2. **Originality and Contribution**
The degree of novelty, innovation, and significance of the research in advancing knowledge or practice in the field.
3. **Methodological Rigor**
The soundness, validity, and reliability of the methods, analyses, and results presented.
4. **Ethical Standards**
Compliance with ethical guidelines and professional codes of conduct relevant to the research area.
5. **Clarity of Presentation**
The coherence, organization, and accuracy of the writing, as well as the quality of figures, tables, and references.

In addition to the peer review, all submissions were screened for textual overlap to detect potential plagiarism or redundant publication. This process was carried out using plagiarism detection software, and any manuscripts with significant overlap were flagged for further editorial investigation. Papers failing to meet ethical and originality standards were not considered for publication.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	95
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	61
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	25
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	26.3%

Number of reviewers 16

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

The editorial team is committed to ensuring transparency, fairness, and integrity throughout the review and publication process. Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee has any financial, professional, or personal relationships that could be perceived as influencing their judgment in handling submissions for this conference. By declaring the absence of competing interests, the committee affirms that all editorial and review decisions were made objectively and based solely on the academic quality and relevance of the submitted work.

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.

