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All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 3rd International Conference on Reinventing Business Practices, start-ups and Sustainability - ICRBSS 2023 during 2-3 November 2023 in Chennai. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Scientific Advisory 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 2 reviewers independently.

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. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it had received favourable recommendations from the at least one of the reviewers.

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.

The editors have recused from the handling of papers coauthored by them and the ones authored by closely related authors, and every possible step has been taken to reduce unconscious bias.

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;
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total submissions</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of articles sent for peer review</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of accepted articles</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reviewers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Competing interests refer to any interests of the Editor-in-Chief and/or members of the review body, that may or may be perceived to influence editorial decisions. It is normal to have interests, even competing ones, but the ethics of scientific publication demands that any competing interests be properly declared, and that appropriate steps be taken to uphold the validity of the editorial process in their presence.

This is the proper section to document competing interests and the measures to address them. We show three examples here, and we encourage the organizers to consult the Publisher’s and/or COPE guidelines for further information. In case of uncertainty, please contact the Publisher.

Some of the authors were known to the Editor-in-Chief, who also supervised one of the authors (Shivani Kapoor), who has recused herself from handling their submissions and has delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.