

# Peer-Review Statements

Bing Liu<sup>1</sup>, Ziqiang Zeng<sup>2\*</sup>, Edward Ng Hon Khay<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Huainan Normal University, China

<sup>2</sup> Sichuan University, China

<sup>3</sup> Singapore Management University, Singapore

\*Editor-in-Chief of the ICEMED 2022. Email: zengziqiang@scu.edu.cn

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 2022 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Enterprise Management and Economic Development (ICEMED2022) during May 27-29, 2022 in Dalian, China. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Scientific Committees and reviewers] 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 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was AIS Scholar Online Editorial System.

All new manuscripts to ICEMED 2022 should be submitted directly via AIS Scholar Online Editorial System. By using the online system, you can access and process submitted papers from anywhere with internet access, and all the records including files and exchange will be maintained.

Step 1. To keep scientific integrity, one of our editors will run Turnitin on each new submission to see if has problem of possible plagiarism. Papers not passing plagiarism check will be desk rejected immediately.

Step 2. Then the publication chairs will have an initial check on new submission to ensure if it's within scope of the conference, and decide if it merits further review. If the new manuscript passed the initial check, it will be assigned to reviewers for single-blind peer review.

Step 3. Each of selected paper will be reviewed by at least two/three independent experts with related research background mainly on originality, validity, quality and readability.

Step 4. Review Reports received from the experts will be judged by one of the editors with international scientific standards.

Step 5. If logical, then Review Reports will be sent to authors to modify the manuscript accordingly. If not logical, then editor can assign new reviewer or can also judge at his/her own.

Step 6. Authors will be required to revise their papers according to the points raised.

Step 7. Revised version will then be evaluated by the editor whether the points raised by the reviewers have been addressed or not.

Step 8. Then the editor will send the revised manuscript to the reviewers again for re-evaluation.

Step 9. If the reviewers approve the revise version of the manuscript, then the Editor-in-Chief will make final decision for the publication.]

## 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 of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;
2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
3. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
4. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
5. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

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

Firstly, we ask authors are checked for textual overlap before they submit their papers to the AIS Scholar Online Editorial System.

Secondly, in order to eliminate plagiarism more effectively, all accepted papers are checked again for textual overlap before being submitted to the publisher.

### **3. KEY METRICS**

Total submissions	495
Number of articles sent for peer review	490
Number of accepted articles	219
Acceptance rate	45%
Number of reviewers	198

### **4. COMPETING INTERESTS**

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest.