Peer-Review Statements

Liew Chee Yoong

Department of Accounting and Finance
Faculty of Business and Management (FBM)
UCSI University

Editor-in-Chief of the FIMM 2026. Email: *liewcy@ucsiuniversity.edu.my*

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *Conference abbreviation 2026 2nd International Conference on Financial Innovation and Marketing Management (FIMM 2026)* during *July 2–4, 2026* in *Singapore, 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.

1. Manuscript Allocation Within one week after submission, the Editor-in-Chief assigns each manuscript to 2–3 independent reviewers with expertise aligned to the paper's topic. Reviewers must declare no conflicts of interest (e.g., collaborations, institutional affiliations, or financial ties with authors) prior to participation.
2. Initial Screening (1 week): Reviewers conduct a preliminary check for compliance with formatting guidelines, structural completeness (abstract, methods, results, etc.), and thematic relevance. Manuscripts failing to meet basic standards are desk-rejected, with detailed feedback provided to authors.
3. In-Depth Evaluation (3 weeks): Reviewers assess the manuscript's originality, methodological validity, data integrity, and contribution to the field. Evaluations include:
   - A categorical rating (Accept/Minor Revision/Major Revision/Reject)
   - Constructive comments for improvement
   - A confidential recommendation to the Editor
4. Decision-Making & Conflict Resolution The Editor consolidates reviews and resolves discrepancies through panel discussions. Final decisions prioritize both scholarly rigor and a target acceptance rate of 【40%】, which balances selectivity with support for emerging research. Borderline manuscripts may undergo additional review or statistical validation.

© The Author(s) 2026
L. C. Yoong (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2026 2nd International Conference on Financial Innovation and Marketing Management (FIMM 2026)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 408,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-801-6_1

5. Author Notification Authors receive a decision within 1-week post-review, including anonymized reviewer comments. Accepted manuscripts proceed to production; others may be invited to resubmit after revision (2-month revision window).

6. Revisions & Appeals Revised manuscripts are re-evaluated within 2 weeks. Authors may appeal decisions with a point-by-point rebuttal, which triggers an independent audit by the Editorial Board.

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 Innovation: Is the paper presenting new ideas, methodologies, or findings? Does it contribute to the advancement of the field?
2. Technical Soundness: Are the methods used sound and appropriate? Is the analysis rigorous? Are the results well-supported by the data?
3. Relevance to the Conference: Does the paper fit within the scope of the conference themes and tracks?
4. Clarity and Organization: Is the paper well-organized, with clear arguments and structure? Are the ideas presented in a coherent and understandable way?
5. Literature Review and References: Does the paper appropriately engage with existing literature? Is there a clear understanding of the state of the field?
6. Ethical Considerations: Does the research adhere to ethical standards, especially in areas like data privacy, human subjects, etc.?
7. Practical Implications: For applied research, reviewers will also assess the potential practical impact or applications of the findings.
8. Each of these criteria is typically scored on a numerical scale (e.g., 1-5), and reviewers are asked to provide detailed feedback and suggestions for improvement.

Ethics & Transparency

1. COPE Compliance: All participants follow the COPE Ethical Guidelines.
2. Gender/Geographic Inclusion: Reviewers evaluate whether gender, race, or geographic factors are appropriately addressed.
3. Diversity Auditors: 2 committee members monitor demographic balance in accepted papers quarterly.
4. AI Usage: AI tools (e.g., plagiarism detection, statistical error flags) assist but never replace human judgment.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	358
Number of articles sent for peer review	322
Number of accepted articles	157
Acceptance rate	48%
Number of reviewers	32

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 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, 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 changes were made.

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.

