



# Peer-Review Statements

Murni Rachmawati<sup>1</sup>, Khusnul Hanifati<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Architecture, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), Surabaya 60111, Indonesia

\*Editor-in-Chief of the **ARDC 2025**. Email: [khusnulhanifati@its.ac.id](mailto:khusnulhanifati@its.ac.id)

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *International Conference on Architectural Research and Design (ARDC 2025)* during *November 3, 2025* in *Surabaya, 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 **23** reviewer(s) independently.

*The conference submission management system was Easychair.*

The review process was conducted in two stages: extended abstract submission and full paper submission.

At the extended abstract stage, submissions were first screened for generic quality and overall suitability. Abstracts that passed this initial screening were then assessed through an internal peer review to evaluate their academic quality and potential for further development into full papers. Based on this stage, submissions were either rejected or accepted for progression to the full paper stage.

At the full paper stage, manuscripts were again screened for generic quality and suitability. Papers that met the screening criteria were subsequently sent for external peer review under a double-blind review process, with reviewers assigned according to their subject expertise. If a reviewer identified a potential conflict of interest or perceived a close association with the authors or the research topic, the manuscript was reassigned to another reviewer. A paper was considered for acceptance only if it received favourable recommendations from two reviewers, drawing on both internal and external evaluations. 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. Relevance to Conference Themes: Alignment with the conference scope and key themes, including Global South architecture, cultural resilience, and spatial narratives.
2. Clarity of Research Framing: Clear articulation of the research problem, objectives, contributions, and overall structure of the paper.
3. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework: Appropriate and relevant theoretical grounding in relation to the conference themes.
4. Methodological or Analytical Quality: Clarity and suitability of the methodological or analytical approach for addressing the research aims.
5. Results and Discussion: Clear presentation and interpretation of findings, with meaningful engagement with theory and prior work.
6. Originality and Contribution: Novelty of ideas, perspectives, data, or methods, and contribution to the field.
7. Language and Presentation: Clarity, coherence, academic writing quality, and adherence to submission guidelines.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. All papers were screened for textual similarity using Turnitin prior to publication.

## 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	43
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	34
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	29
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	67.4%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	23

*[Any additional information about article statistics belongs to this section, but the listing should suffice in most situations. More rows can be added if necessary, but please do not delete any existing row. Numbers are for example only. “Acceptance rate” is (number of accepted articles) divided by (number of total submissions).]*

## 4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Competing interests refer to any relationships or roles that could potentially influence, or be perceived to influence, editorial or review decisions. All such cases were transparently declared and managed to ensure the integrity of the review process.

In this conference, La Ode Muhammad Illyin Abdul Rahman was supervised by the Editor, Murni Rachmawati, and by an internal peer reviewer, Setyo Nugroho. To avoid any conflict of interest, the Editor and the involved internal reviewer did not take part in the evaluation or decision-making process for this submission, which was handled by other reviewers with no personal or professional ties to the author.

Setyo Nugroho and Didit Novianto served as internal peer reviewers while also contributing as authors. Their submissions were therefore reviewed by both internal and external peer reviewers who had no competing interests, and they were excluded from any review or editorial decisions related to their own work.

Author Adista Imi Oktavia was supervised by an internal peer reviewer, Purwanita Setijanti. To maintain impartiality, the manuscript was reviewed by other internal and external reviewers without any supervisory or personal relationship with the author.

Author Izzah Desta Bastian Ramadhani was supervised by Setyo Nugroho, who also served as an internal peer reviewer. In this case, the supervisor did not participate in the review of the manuscript, which was instead evaluated by other internal and external reviewers without competing interests.

Author Nareswaranandya was supervised by Arina Hayati, an internal peer reviewer. To maintain impartiality, the manuscript was reviewed by internal and external reviewers who had no supervisory or personal relationship with the author.

In one of the submitted manuscripts, Khusnul Hanifati, the Editor-in-Chief, was listed as a co-author and author. In accordance with ethical publishing standards, the Editor-in-Chief was fully recused from handling, reviewing, or making editorial decisions regarding this manuscript. The review process was conducted by other members of the Scientific Committee and external reviewers with no competing interests.

In addition, the conference was funded by the Department of Architecture, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), which also supported some of the research presented at the conference. All authors and reviewers were required to disclose their funding sources. Manuscripts arising from research funded by the Department of Architecture ITS were reviewed by members of the Scientific Committee and external reviewers who had no personal, supervisory, or financial interests in the 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.

