# Peer-Review Statements

Ramji Nagariya[1,*] Pankaj Dhaundiyal[2,] Kaliyan Mathiyazhagan[3] and Vinaytosh Mishra[4]

[1] School of Business and Management, CHRIST University, Bengaluru, India

[2] School of Business and Management, CHRIST University, Bengaluru, India

[3]Thiagarajar School of Management, Madurai, India

[4]Thumbay Institute for AI in Healthcare, Gulf Medical University, Ajman, UAE

[*]Editor-in-Chief of the ICSBPIM-2025. Email: ramji@christuniversity.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *2nd International Conference on Sustainable Business Practices and Innovative Models-2025* during *23-24 April 2025"* in *School of Business and Management, CHRIST University, Delhi-NCR, Ghaziabad, India*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *review 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 *at least 2* reviewer(s) independently.

*The conference submission management system was EquinOCS*

The double-blind peer review process was followed. The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitableness. Many authors submitted the abstract only, so we asked them to submit full papers. After the initial screening of the full papers, they were sent for double-blind 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 two 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 decided based on the quality of final submitted version.

The papers out of scope of the book/conference proceedings are not included in the book series. These papers were rejected.

*To avoid the biasness in the review process, first we created a pool of reviewers and then the papers were assigned to the reviewers. It was kept in mind that the reviewer should not be known to the author(s). As we received the papers from different institutions so chances of biasness in review process was negligible.*

## 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. In some necessary cases the plagiarism generated by Turnitin was also asked from the authors so as to ensure that the submissions are plagiarism free. Once the plagiarism was submitted by the author then the decision of acceptance was made.

## 3. KEY METRICS

| | |
|---:|:---|
| *Total submissions* | 600 |
| *Number of articles sent for peer review* | 300 |
| *Number of accepted articles* | 75 |
| *Acceptance rate* | 12.5% |
| *Number of reviewers* | 150 |

## 4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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