

---

GUIDELINE FOR REVIEWER  
**The 5<sup>th</sup> Asia Pacific Management Research Conference**

**Responsibility of Peer Reviewer**

The peer reviewer is responsible for critiquing by reading and evaluating manuscripts in the field of expertise, then giving constructive advice and honest feedback to the author of the article submitted. In addition, peer reviewers discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, how to increase the strength and quality of the paper, and evaluate the relevance and authenticity of the manuscript.

**Before reviewing, please note the following:**

Is the article requested to be reviewed in accordance with your expertise? If you receive a script that covers topics that are not appropriate areas of your expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please recommend an alternative reviewer.

Do you have the time to review this paper? If you agree and require a more extended period, notify the editor as soon as possible, or suggest an alternative reviewer.

**Review Process**

When reviewing the article, please consider the following:

- Title: is it clearly illustrating the article?
- Abstract: does it reflect the contents of the article?
- Introduction: does it describe the accuracy of matters submitted by the author and clearly state the problem being considered? Typically, the introduction should summarize the context of the relevant research and explain the research findings or other findings, if any, offered for discussion. This research should describe the experiments, hypotheses, and methods.

**Content of the Article**

To determine the originality and suitability for the journal, are there any elements of plagiarism over 20% of this paper field? (The APMRC editorial team carries out the similarity rate check).

Please consider the following:

- If other authors had previously done the study, is it still eligible for publication?
- Is the article relatively new, reasonably deep, and interesting to be published?
- Does it contribute to knowledge?
- Does the article adhere to the standards of the conference and also the proceeding?
- Scope - Is the article in line with the objectives and scope of the conference and also the proceeding?

**Method**

**Comprehensive and perfect:**

- Does the author accurately describe how the data is collected?
  - Is the theoretical basis or reference used appropriately for this study?
  - Is the exposure design suitable for the answer to the question?
  - Is there decent enough information for you to imitate the research?
  - Does the article identify the following procedures?
  - Are there any new methods? If there is a new method, does the author explain it in detail?
  - Is there any appropriate sampling?
  - Have the tools and materials used been adequately explained? And
  - does the article exposure describe what data is recorded in describing the measurement?
-

---

**Results:**

This is where the author must explain the findings of their research. It should be clearly laid out and in a logical sequence. You will need to consider whether the appropriate analysis has been carried out; the use of statistical tools? If you have better statistical tools to be used in this study, notify it, and the interpretation need not be included in this section.

**Discussion and Conclusion:**

- Are the fair results and quite reasonable support the claims in this section?
- Does the author compare the research results with other previous ones?
- Do the research results in the article contradict the previous theories?
- Does the conclusion explain how better scientific research is to be followed up?

**Tables and Pictures:**

Is it suitable with the referred explanation by showing data that is easy to interpret and understandable for the readers?

**Writing Styles**

- Authors must be critical mostly of the systematic literature review of the issues relevant to the field of study.
- Reviews should be focused on a single topic.
- All exposure should be in English and written in good and coherent grammar.
- Easy to understand
- Interesting to read

**Things that need to be considered:**

- Perspective is a unique perspective that describes experiences and situations related to issues in marketing management, finance management, strategic management, operation management, human resource management, management accounting, business economics, and entrepreneurship.

**Originality Research**

- The original data and testing must present a new approach to improve the tools' systems, processes, and precision.
- Research policy and observational analysis should clarify the feasibility, effectiveness, and implementation of the research results. It is not limited to marketing management, finance management, strategic management, operation management, human resource management, e-business, knowledge management, management accounting, management control system, management information system, international business, business economics, business ethics and sustainability, and entrepreneurship.
- In Practice (case study), The paper should explain the situation regarding the future challenges in marketing management, finance management, strategic management, operation management, human resource management, e-business, knowledge management, management accounting, management control system, management information system, international business, business economics, business ethics and sustainable, and entrepreneurship, within its conclusions, and things which can be learned.

**Reference**

- First Person (Interview)
  - Book Reviews
  - Insight Technology (Product Review)
-

---

### **Final Review**

- All results of the review submitted by reviewers are confidential.
- If you want to discuss the article with a colleague, kindly inform the editor.
- Do not contact the author directly.
- Ethical issues:
  - Plagiarism: if you suspect the article is mostly plagiarism from other authors, please let the editor know the details
  - Fraud: It is very difficult to detect a fraud category, but if you suspect the results in the article are not true, please inform the editor
  -

Complete your review by the due date to the editorial office. Your recommendation for the article will be considered when the editor makes a final decision, and your honest feedback is highly appreciated.

When you write a comment, please show the part of the comment that is only intended for the editor and parts that can be returned to the author.

---