

Peer-Review Statements

Fefri Indra Arza^{1*}

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang

*Editor-in-Chief of the 8th PICEEBA. Email: fefriarza@gmail.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 8th Padang International Conference on Education, Economics, Business, and Accounting or the 8th PICEEBA during 13th in Padang. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Scientific Board 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 peer reviews. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was <http://piceeba.fe.unp.ac.id/index.php/piceeba8/piceeba8/login>.

The submitted manuscripts would be checked whether it complies PICEEBA author guidelines and template for submission, also whether the manuscript matches the focus and scope. If appropriate, the next process will be carried out. The editor will notify immediately via email. The manuscripts would be checked with Turnitin (similarity check). We really concern about plagiarism issues. The manuscripts would be reviewed by an assigned editor to find out whether it contributes sufficiently to the development of knowledge. The manuscripts that qualify at this stage would be proceeded to the review stage by two peer reviewers. The manuscript that is accepted with revisions (minor or major), it would contain comments from peer reviewers and would be returned to the author for revision. The author is given the time to revise the manuscript no later than one month. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

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

Total submissions	112
Number of articles sent for peer review	112
Number of accepted articles	98
Acceptance rate	81,67%
Number of reviewers	35

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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