

Peer-Review Statements

Ratih Hurriyati^{1,*} Lili Adi Wibowo², Ade Gafar Abdullah³, S.Sulastri⁴,
L.Lisnawati⁵

¹ Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

² Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

³ Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

⁴ Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

⁵ Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

*Editosr-in-Chief of the [The 6th Global Conference on Business, Management and Entrepreneurship (GCBME 2021)]. Email: ratih@upi.edu

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [The 6th Global Conference on Business, Management and Entrepreneurship (GCBME 2021)] during [18 August 2021] in [Bandung - Indonesia]. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Lili Adi Wibowo, Ade Gafar Abdullah, S.Sulastri, L.Lisnawati] 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 (two)] reviewer(s) independently.

[The conference submission management system was Konferenzi.]

The review procedure :

1. Articles sent through a review process, especially checking the suitability of the manuscript with the scope and compliance with the proceeding template. In this process, the editor will establish communication with the author so that the manuscript deserves to be sent to the reviewer or even returned/declined
2. Manuscripts that have passed stage 1 above, are then sent to 2 reviewers for their content to be reviewed using the Double Blind Peer Review method.
3. The review process will consider plagiarism, novelty, objectivity, methods, scientific impact, conclusions and references
4. Reviewers will suggest improvements and or accept/reject articles
5. For articles that get notes from reviewers, they will be sent to the author to be revised and resubmitted
6. Articles that have been updated will be proofread to check readability in order to minimize errors in the

use of punctuation, spelling, consistency in the use of names or terms, to word fragmentation.

7. The ready script will be layout then metadata and sent to the publisher

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.

3. KEY METRICS

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Total submissions</i> | 149 |
| <i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i> | 113 |
| <i>Number of accepted articles</i> | 101 |

Acceptance rate 67,78%
Number of reviewers 9

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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