



# Peer-Review Statements

Keni Keni<sup>1,\*</sup> Teoh Ai Ping<sup>2</sup> Hetty Karunia Tunjungsari<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Tarumanagara

<sup>2</sup> Universiti Sains Malaysia

\*Editor-in-Chief of the Fourteenth International Conference on Entrepreneurship and Business Management 2025 Email: keni@fe.untar.ac.id, hetty@fe.untar.ac.id

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *Fourteenth International Conference on Entrepreneurship and Business Management 2025* during November 11-12, 2025 in Ngee Ann Polytechnics, Singapore. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the Scientific 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 reviewer(s) 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 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 final.

## 2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers are instructed to evaluate submissions based solely on the **academic merit** of the content. The assessment should be made across the following dimensions:

### 1. Pertinence to Conference Scope and Themes

- **Relevance:** The submission clearly addresses topics that fall within the defined scope and themes of the conference.
- **Contribution to the Field:** The work contributes meaningfully to the current discourse within the conference's subject area.
- **Audience Fit:** The content is likely to be of interest and value to conference attendees.

## 2. Originality and Novelty

- **Innovative Ideas:** The paper presents novel concepts, methodologies, models, or perspectives.
- **Contribution:** The work adds original insights or extends existing knowledge in a meaningful way.
- **Avoidance of Redundancy:** The submission does not duplicate existing work and shows a clear distinction from prior literature.

## 3. Technical Quality and Soundness

- **Methodological Rigor:** The research design, data analysis, and methods are appropriate, rigorous, and well-justified.
- **Correctness:** The arguments and conclusions are logically sound and well-supported by evidence.
- **Reproducibility (if applicable):** Sufficient detail is provided to replicate the study or reproduce the results.

## 4. Clarity and Organization

- **Structure:** The paper is well-organized, with clear sections such as abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion.
- **Writing Quality:** The language is clear, concise, and grammatically correct.
- **Figures and Tables:** Visual elements are relevant, well-labeled, and enhance understanding of the content.

## 5. Significance and Impact

- **Theoretical Impact:** The work deepens or challenges existing theoretical frameworks or understanding.
- **Practical Implications:** The results have potential applications in practice, policy, or further research.
- **Long-Term Value:** The submission has the potential to influence future work or open new avenues of inquiry.

## 6. Engagement with Literature

- **Literature Review:** The paper demonstrates awareness of and engagement with relevant prior work.
- **Positioning:** The work is appropriately situated in relation to existing studies, with clear articulation of how it builds upon or diverges from them.

## Recommendation Guidelines

- Reviewers are encouraged to provide a **justified recommendation** based on the above criteria, typically choosing from:

- **Accept** (meets all key quality thresholds)
- **Accept with Minor Revisions** (solid work with small fixable issues)
- **Reject with Encouragement to Revise** (potentially strong work, but major issues present)
- **Reject** (fundamental flaws or outside scope)

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

<i>Total submissions</i>	110
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	110
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	20
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	18%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	21

### 4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution- NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this chapter or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

