# Peer-Review Statements

Huda Maulana(✉), Muhammad Sholahuddin, Muhammad Anas, and Zulfikar Zulfikar

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia
huda.maulana@ums.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the ICOEBS on $5^{th}$ and $6^{th}$ *December 2022* in *Surakarta, Indonesia*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the appointed ICOEBS 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 *2* reviewers independently. *The conference submission management system was Remit.*

The blind review process ensures the quality and fairness of our conference proceedings. All submitted papers undergo a thorough evaluation by at least two independent reviewers who are experts in their respective fields. To maintain objectivity and impartiality, both authors and reviewers remain anonymous to each other throughout the entire review process. This way, reviewers can focus solely on the quality and originality of the research without any bias or influence from the authors' personal background or affiliations.

After the initial review, our track editors and editor convene to discuss the reviewers' feedback and make the final decision on whether to accept or reject the submission. To ensure transparency and accountability, we provide authors with detailed feedback and suggestions for improvement, even in cases where the submission is not accepted. Our double-blind review process has been designed to uphold the highest academic standards and to provide authors with a fair and constructive evaluation of their work.

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. 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. Originality and level of innovativeness;
2. Thematic relevance for the call for papers;
3. Significance for theory or practice;

---

H. Maulana—Editor-in-Chief of the ICOEBS.

4. Abstract
5. Methodology well discussed;
6. Quality of presentation of tables and figures.
7. Conclusion supported by results of work and future work
8. Structure of presentation
9. Quality of content and completeness
10. References
11. Clarity
12. Language used

## 3  Key Metrics

| | |
|---|---|
| Total submissions | 137 |
| Number of articles sent for peer review | 107 |
| Number of accepted articles | 88 |
| Acceptance rate | 64% |
| Number of reviewers | 22 |

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