

CERTIFICATION for the PEER REVIEW PROCESS &  
EVALUATION of the PEER REVIEW PROCESS &  
CERTIFICATION for NON EXISTENCE of ARTIFICIAL CITATIONS  
and ANTI-PLAGIARISM CONTROL

Name : Dr.dr. Siti Soekiswati, S.H., M.H  
Institution : Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta  
City : Surakarta  
Country : Indonesia  
Phone : (+62) 85867335485  
Academic Email : [ss123@ums.ac.id](mailto:ss123@ums.ac.id)

I declare, I confirm, I certify and I sign that I received substantial, important, line by line peer review with several and substantial comments, important remarks and hints from, at least, 3 Reviewers and the Assistant Editor for my paper: **Exploration of the Impact of Religious Activities on Waste Management Behavior: An Analysis of the Understanding of Environmental Ethics** with Authors:

SITI SOEKISWATI, RIZKA RIZKA, ERNA HERAWATI, AZHAR ALAM, ARIEF BUDIONO\*, KELIK WARDIONO

I would like to thank all the reviewers for their thoughtful comments and efforts towards improving our manuscript. We revised the manuscript with special attention to the comments that we received from **Three (3)** reviewers that were experts, specialists in the area of my paper. I declare, confirm, certify and sign that WSEAS has checked my paper for possible plagiarism by Turnitin and my paper was found without plagiarism or self-plagiarism by Turnitin. I also declare, confirm, certify and sign that also that no Associate-Editor, no Editor-in-Chief, no member of the WSEAS Secretariat forced me in this Journal to add references (citations) to any previous publications of the journal.

I also declare, confirm, certify and sign that I have made all the changes, modifications, additions, studies, corrections asked by the reviewers and I have fully complied with their instructions. I also understand that before the publication the 3 (or more than 3) reviewers will check my paper to see if all the changes, modifications, additions, studies, corrections etc have been done and I authorize the WSEAS to publish my paper or to reject my paper even in the 2nd round of peer review or to continue with an additional round of peer review.

**I also declare, I confirm, I certify and I sign that I will not publish this paper or an important part of the paper in any other Journal (inside or outside WSEAS) Conference Proceedings (inside or outside WSEAS), Book (inside or outside WSEAS), University Repository etc) without the written permission of the WSEAS.**

**I also declare, I confirm, I certify and I sign that this paper or an important part of the paper has not been published other Journal (inside or outside WSEAS) Conference Proceedings (inside or outside WSEAS), Book (inside or outside WSEAS), University Repository etc). In case of violation of the above terms, WSEAS can reject any unpublished paper or even retract any published paper.**

Please, write additional comments below (take ideas from: <http://wseas.org/main/author-testimonials.html> )

Signature (insert an image file with scanned signature or print out the whole page, sign and scan)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Calm', written in a cursive style.

Date: 15-12-2023

Reviewer 1

-----

A list of points that appears to deserve to be better clarified in the paper together with some suggestions follows.

1) The presentation of the section 3 (Results) needs improvements and more details.

Answers: Authors added more details and improvement. (in red highlighting)

2) The authors must provide more ideas about future research in this area.

Answers: authors provide more ideas about future research in this area (in Bold-Red Highlighting)

3) The authors should explain the contribution of their study in comparison with the corresponding studies of other researchers.

Answers: The researcher explains this contribution in the final paragraph in the introduction, marked with a red highlighted

4) It is mentioned in page 8 that 'The relationship between mental processes and environmental factors will form a reciprocal pattern, i.e., they influence each other. Thus, there is a desire to preserve the environment with proper waste management.'. More justification should be furnished on this issue.

Answers: authors added justification in red highlighted

Additional Questions:

=====

Does the paper contribute to the body of knowledge?: The authors should explain the contribution of their study in comparison with the corresponding studies of other researchers.

Answers: contribution added in introduction (with red Highlighting)

Is the paper technically sound?: Yes.

Answers: thank you for your appreciation

Is the subject matter presented in a comprehensive manner?: The presentation of the section 3 should be improved.

Answers: authors improved section 3 in various highlighting

Are the references provided applicable and sufficient?: Yes

Answers: thank you for your appreciation

Recommendation: The authors need to comply with recommendations.

Answers: thank you for your suggestion, authors believe this would be strengthened this manuscript

Reviewer 2

-----

Some points should be included within the manuscript in order to improve the publication.

- a) In section 4 the authors describe the research methods. What are the other feasible methods? How will these affect the results? More details should be mentioned.

Answers: authors revised methods, added affected results and more details (in Green Highlighted)

- b) The conclusion section is too long. It is better if it is renamed to 'Discussion'. After this section a short conclusion section should be added.

Answers: authors added originally conclusion to discussion and adeed new short conclusion (in Green Bold highlighted)

- c) A comparison with the state-of-the-art research papers are very informative and will enrich the research findings in this manuscript.

Answers: comparison with the state of the art research papers added (in Yellow Highlighted)

Additional Questions:

=====

Does the paper contribute to the body of knowledge?: Yes

Answers: Thank you for appreciation

Is the paper technically sound?: Yes

Answers: Thank you for appreciation

Is the subject matter presented in a comprehensive manner?: Improvements are needed.

Answers: Authors added improvement in several highlighted

Are the references provided applicable and sufficient?: They are sufficient.

Answers: Thank you for appreciation

Recommendation: The paper can be accepted after major revision.

Answers: Thank you for appreciation, authors revised according suggestion and major revision

Reviewer 3

-----

Comments:

The conclusions drawn from the tables 1 and 2 are not well grounded. The conclusions need to be substantiated in more detail.

Especially, section 4 "Discussion" should be rewritten because it is incomprehensible.

Answers: Authors rewritten Section 4 Discussion by adding several information in discussion and sending to English expert for comprehensive write (in Various highlighted). Authors changes conclusion (in red highlighted)

The comment regarding 'Religion-based changes in the environmental ethics behavior in waste management which occurred among the attendees of the SF mosque can hopefully become an inspiration for this country's waste management efforts.' should be better explained.

Answers: Explanation added (in Blue Highlighted)

Additional Questions:

=====

Does the paper contribute to the body of knowledge?: There is a contribution.

Thank you for your appreciation

Is the paper technically sound?: Yes.

Thank you for your appreciation

Is the subject matter presented in a comprehensive manner?: No. It can be improved.

Answers: authors revised several subject matters in a comprehensive manners

Are the references provided applicable and sufficient?: Yes

Thank you for your appreciation

Recommendation: Publish the paper after corrections.

Answers: Thank you for your appreciation, authors had been made corrections according to reviewers suggestion