



Peer-Review Statements

Bonifacius Hendar Putranto^{1*}, Henilia Yulita², Rony Agustino Siahaan³,
Mujiono Mujiono⁴, Taufan Wijaya⁵, Nona Evita⁶

^{1,2,3,4,5,6} Universitas Multimedia Nusantara, Tangerang, Indonesia

hendar2007@umn.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *International Conference on Communication and New Media Studies (COMNEWS) 2025*, held on 14–17 October 2025 in Melaka, Malaysia. These articles have been peer reviewed by members of the Technical Program 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 conducted using a double-blind peer review process. Each submission was evaluated independently by at least two reviewers.

All submissions were managed by the Technical Program Committee through the conference submission system. Manuscripts were first screened for relevance to the conference themes and compliance with submission guidelines. Submissions that met these requirements were then assigned to reviewers based on their expertise, while ensuring that no conflicts of interest were present.

Reviewers provided detailed feedback and recommendations categorized as: accept without revision, accept with minor revision, revise and resubmit, or reject. Authors of submissions requiring revision were given the opportunity to improve their manuscripts based on the reviewers’ comments.

Only papers that were accepted and presented at International COMNEWS 2025 were included in this proceedings volume. Final decisions were made based on reviewers’ evaluations and the quality of the revised submissions.

To ensure fairness and academic integrity, reviewer anonymity was maintained throughout the process, and all submissions were evaluated solely based on academic merit.

2 Quality Criteria

Reviewers assessed submissions based on the following criteria:

1. Relevance to the conference themes;
2. Originality and novelty of the research;
3. Strength of theoretical foundation and literature review;

4. Methodological soundness;
5. Clarity of analysis and findings;
6. Contribution to knowledge or practice;
7. Organization and structure of the manuscript;
8. Clarity and accuracy of language, including figures and tables;
9. Compliance with formatting and submission requirements.

All submitted manuscripts were also checked for textual similarity to detect possible plagiarism, in accordance with the publisher’s policies.

3 Key Metrics

Metric	Value
Total submissions	[61]
Number of articles sent for peer review	[32]
Number of accepted articles	[23]
Acceptance rate	[37,7]
Number of reviewers	[22]

4 Competing Interests

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Technical Program Committee declares any competing interest that could have influenced the editorial decisions. Any potential conflicts of interest identified during the review process were addressed by reassigning the manuscript to reviewers and editors with no relevant conflicts.

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.

