



Peer-Review Statements

Sholahuddin Al Fatih^{1,*}, Hilaire Tegnan², Muhamad Helmi Md. Said³, Nur Rohim Yunus⁴, Abdullah Saeed⁵, Fokke. J. Fernhout⁶, Teng Junaidi Gunawan⁷, Mokhammad Najih⁸, Jady Zaidi Hassim⁹, Dewa Gede Sudika Mangku¹⁰, Hasnan Bachtiar¹¹, Fifik Wiryani¹², Hikmahanto Juwana¹³, Sonny Zuhuda¹⁴, Muhammad Fauzan¹⁵, Irma Cahyaningtyas¹⁶, Kholis Roisah¹⁷, Syamsul Arifin¹⁸

¹ University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia

² William & Mary Law School, Williamsburg, Virginia, USA

³ Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

⁴ Gosudarstvennyy Universitet Upravleniya, Moscow, Russia

⁵ University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

⁶ Maastricht University, Maastricht, Germany

⁷ Universitas 17 Agustus Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

⁸ University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia

⁹ Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

¹⁰ Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Bali, Indonesia

¹¹ Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia

¹² University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia

¹³ Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

¹⁴ Islamic International University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

¹⁵ Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia

¹⁶ Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

¹⁷ Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

¹⁸ University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia

*Editor-in-Chief of the **6th International Conference on Law Reform**

Email: salfatih@umm.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *6th International Conference on Law Reform* during *July 21-23, 2025* in *Rayz Hotel, Malang, East Java, 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 EDAS (<https://edas.info/>). Due to several obstacles in using EDAS, submissions also use Google Forms.

The article review process is carried out in several stages. First, the call for papers and conference announcement is made through various channels, such as social media, email, and websites. The announcement includes the topic, submission deadline, article template, and other guidelines that authors must follow. Second, authors submit their articles on the designated platform, namely EDAS or Google Form.

Third, the editorial team will then conduct an initial verification to ensure that the articles meet the specified format and requirements. Fourth, the next stage is the initial screening, where the Editor in Chief assesses the suitability of the articles to the conference topics and the quality of the articles. At this stage, plagiarism checks are also conducted using Turnitin. Articles that do not meet the requirements may be rejected at this stage without further review.

Fifth, articles that pass the initial screening will be submitted to reviewers selected based on their expertise. To maintain objectivity, the review process is conducted double-blind, so that the identities of the authors and reviewers remain confidential. Reviewers are given between two and four weeks to assess the quality of the articles based on originality, methodology, research quality, and contribution to the field. The assessment results will be sent via a form provided, including comments for the author and recommendations. The review results can be in the form of article accepted, accepted with minor revisions, accepted with major revisions, or rejected. If revisions are required, authors are given the opportunity to revise their articles according to the reviewers' suggestions and are given a deadline for resubmitting the revised articles. Acceptance or rejection of articles is final. In the final stage, after the final articles are accepted, they undergo editing to ensure that they are free of grammatical errors and conform to the templates provided by Atlantis Press.

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. Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;
2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
3. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
4. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
5. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	75
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	70
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	32
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	43%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	18

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.

