Peer-Review Statements

Bejoy Joseph[1*], Devi Sekhar R[2]

[1] Associate Professor, Bharata Mata Institute of Management 1

[2] Assistant Professor, Bharata Mata Institute of Management 2
[*]Editor-in-Chief of the [CEFM 2025].
Email: *devisekhar@bharatamatacollege.in*

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *[CEFM 2025]* during *[24th & 25th April 2025]*in *[location]*. 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 *[single-blind]*. Each submission was examined by *[at least 2]* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Meteor

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitableness. Then accepted for presentation. After the presentation, those papers recommended by the session chairs for publications were considered for peer review process. Those endorsed for publication by the reviewers underwent three to four rounds of revision (including formatting) until acceptance was confirmed. The reviewers were given a structured format for conducting the review to ensure uniformity. 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. Contribution to the theory/program development (eg. Originality, Creativity)

2. Appropriateness of the topic

3. Importance of the topic

4. Quality of the research methods

5. Quality of analysis

6.   Quality of Implications

7.   Quality of Writing (The article has to be free from Grammatical errors)

8.   Overall Significance & align to the theme of the conference

9.   Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;

10. 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. Ensured that plagiarism of papers are below 15%.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	85
Number of articles sent for peer review	56
Number of accepted articles	21
Acceptance rate	24.7%
Number of reviewers	8

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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