



Peer-Review Statements

Lucia Rini Sugiarti¹, Ardiani Ika Sulistyawati², Wafda Vivid Izziyana³, Tatas Transinata^{4*}

^{1,2,3,4} Universitas Semarang

*Editor-in-Chief of the 2nd ICOSEND 2025. Email: tatastransinata@gmail.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at thend International Conference on Social Environment Diversity (ICOSEND) from 16th – 17th December 2025 in *Universitas Semarang (USM), Semarang, 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 reviewers independently.

The conference submission management system was Confbeam Konfrenzi (<https://confbeam.org/2025/icosend/kfz/>)

Review Process

The Scientific Committee pre-evaluates new submissions using the Manuscript Readiness Level (MRL) to determine whether the article is suitable for the conference's topic and scope.

- a. We will reject articles that are poorly presented, unclear, or suspected of being plagiarized from other works (please refer to our plagiarism policy).
- b. After the initial screening, the article will be sent to two independent reviewers for peer review.
- c. A single-blind review is implemented, where the reviewers know the authors' identities, but the authors do not know the reviewers' identities.
- d. Peer review comments are confidential and will only be disclosed with explicit consent from the reviewers.
- e. The Scientific Committee will examine the reviewer's comments and explain them to the authors. If revisions are invited, the corresponding author must submit the revised manuscript within 2 weeks.
- f. The final decision is made by the Scientific Committee based on the information obtained through the peer-review process.

We ensure that reviewed manuscripts are treated confidentially before publication, as explained in our publication ethics.

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

- a. Research question: why did the authors do this research, and what is its importance and application?
- b. Novelty: A paper presents new ideas, derivations, and applications that have not been studied before or have been minor—or not studied.
- c. Literature review: to identify the research gap with recent references from 2015 onwards.
- d. Research methodology: analytical, numerical experimental or mixed. What is the authors' contribution, assumptions and/or approximations used, description of apparatus and its limitations, steps of experiments, etc.
- e. Quality of results: and the depth and logic of the discussion.
- f. Insight is conveyed, and recommendations might be made by others for future work.
- g. English: used effectively to communicate the ideas and easy to understand with least or no grammatical errors or typos.

We apply zero tolerance for plagiarism and established the following policy stating specific actions (penalties) when plagiarism is identified in an article submitted for publication in ICOSEND.

Definition: Plagiarism involves the “use or close imitation of the language and thoughts of another author and the representation of them as one’s original work.”

Policy: Papers must be original, unpublished, and not pending publication elsewhere. Any material taken verbatim from another source needs to be identified as different from the present original text by (1) indentation, (2) use of quotation marks, and (3) identification of the source.

Any text of an amount exceeding fair use standards (herein defined as more than two or three sentences or the equivalent thereof) or any graphic material reproduced from another source requires permission from the copyright holder and, if feasible, the original author(s) and also requires identification of the source; e.g., previous publication.

Turnitin will check all submitted papers. When plagiarism is identified, the Scientific Committee will be responsible for the review of this paper and will agree on measures

according to the extent of plagiarism detected in the paper in agreement with the following guidelines:

1. Similarity Index above 40%: Article Rejected (due to poor citation and/or poor paraphrasing, article outright rejected, NO RESUBMISSION accepted).
2. Similarity Index (15-40%): Send to the author for improvement (provide correct citations to all places of similarity and do good paraphrasing even if the citation is provided).
3. Similarity index Less than 15%: Accepted or citation improvement may be required (proper citations must be provided to all outsourced texts).
In cases 2 and 3, the authors should revise the article carefully, add required citations, and paraphrase the outsourced text well. They should then resubmit the article with a new Turnitin report showing.
4. NO PLAGIARISM and similarity less than 20%.

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

Decision

Three types of editorial decisions are made during the peer review process: reject submission, Revision required, and Accept submission.

1. Reject submission

Following peer review, the paper is assessed as unacceptable for publication and resubmission is impossible.

2. Revision required

The article requires revisions before a final decision can be made. The authors are requested to enhance their article based on the comments received from the reviewer and submit a revised version for consideration within two weeks after receiving the decision from the scientific committee. The article may undergo further peer review, and if the authors do not revise their paper to the scientific committee's satisfaction, the article can still be rejected.

3. Accept submission

The paper has been accepted for publication, and minor sub-editing changes and amendments are still possible to ensure that the paper fully meets our criteria. After the final review at the editorial office, the acceptance is confirmed, and the paper is forwarded to the publisher.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	137
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	137
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	63
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	45,9%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	25

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.

