



# Peer-Review Statements

Echo Perdana Kusumah<sup>1\*</sup>, Yanto Yanto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Bangka Belitung, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Bangka Belitung, Indonesia

\*Editor-in-Chief of the 1<sup>st</sup> ICEMAB 2024

Email: echo\_perdana@ubb.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 1<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Economics, Management, Accounting, and Business Digital 2024 (1<sup>st</sup> ICEMAB 2024) during October 15, 2024 in Bangka Belitung Province, 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 at least two reviewers independently. The conference submission management systems used were OCS and email.

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. After the initial screening, they were sent for peer review by matching each paper's topic with the reviewers' expertise, taking into account any competing interests. To maintain the double-blind process, all identifying information of the authors was removed from the submissions before they were distributed to reviewers. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it received favorable recommendations from both reviewers.

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit their work after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

Efforts to improve the peer review process included recusing reviewers from handling papers authored by closely related colleagues to prevent conflicts of interest. Additionally, guidelines were provided to reviewers to minimize unconscious bias, such as focusing solely on the manuscript's content and quality without considering the authors' identities. The double-blind approach itself was a key measure to ensure fairness and objectivity in the evaluation process.

## 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 to the Conference Scope and Themes:  
The extent to which the article’s content aligns with the overall objectives, topics, and themes of the conference.
2. Originality, Novelty, and Timeliness of the Research:  
The degree to which the research presents new ideas, innovative approaches, and addresses current and relevant issues in the field.
3. Soundness of Methods, Analyses, and Results:  
The rigor and appropriateness of the research methodology, the validity of the analyses conducted, and the reliability of the results obtained.
4. Clarity, Cohesion, and Accuracy in Presentation:  
The quality of writing, including logical flow, coherence of arguments, and precision in language. This also encompasses the effective use of figures, tables, and other modes of expression to enhance understanding.
5. Adherence to Ethical Standards and Codes of Conduct:  
Compliance with ethical guidelines relevant to the research field, including proper citation of sources, avoidance of plagiarism, and ethical treatment of any study subjects or data.

In addition to these criteria, all submissions were rigorously checked for textual overlap to detect potential instances of plagiarism. The conference employed advanced plagiarism detection software to ensure the originality of the work. Authors found to have significant overlaps with existing publications were subject to further review and potential rejection. These measures were implemented to uphold the integrity and quality of the conference proceedings.

## 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	27
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	27
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	26
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	96.3%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	9

The conference received a total of 27 submissions, all of which were sent for peer review. The rigorous review process, involving a panel of 9 reviewers, resulted in the acceptance of 26 articles, reflecting an acceptance rate of 96.3%. This high acceptance

rate underscores the quality of submissions received, as well as the reviewers' thorough evaluation based on the conference's quality criteria. Each submission was reviewed to ensure its relevance, originality, methodological soundness, and adherence to ethical standards. The number of reviewers involved ensured a fair distribution of workload, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of the articles. The review process was conducted with strict adherence to double-blind principles to maintain impartiality and integrity.

#### **4. COMPETING INTERESTS**

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest that may influence the editorial decisions.

To maintain the integrity and fairness of the review process, all reviewers were required to disclose any potential competing interests, such as personal or professional relationships with the authors, financial ties, or affiliations that could bias their judgment. In cases where a potential competing interest was identified, the affected reviewers recused themselves from handling the respective submissions, and alternative reviewers with no such interests were assigned.

Additionally, the conference strictly adhered to COPE guidelines to ensure transparency and fairness throughout the editorial process. These measures were implemented to uphold the validity and credibility of the review process.

**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.

