

1. Focus and Scope

- Strategic Management
- Human Resources/Capital
- Operations and Supply Chain
- Organizational Behaviour
- Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- Corporate Governance
- Finance and Accounting Management
- Risk Management
- Marketing Management
- Cost Management
- Sustainable Business Development
- Hospitality and Tourism
- Family Business
- SME's
- Machine Learning in Business

2. Peer Review Process

All manuscripts have gone through a "double blind review" according to COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) means a peer review process where both the authors of a manuscript and the reviewers remain anonymous to each other throughout the evaluation, ensuring that neither party can influence the review based on the other's identity, thus minimizing bias.

a. Description of the peer review process

All manuscripts have gone through a review process by reviewers and editing by the implementing editor. This conference follows the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) <https://publicationethics.org/> guidelines in dealing with all aspects of publication ethics, especially how to handle cases of research and publication errors. This scientific publication ethics statement is a statement of the code of ethics for all parties involved in the publication process of this scientific journal, namely the manager, editor, reviewers, and authors. The Code of Ethics for Scientific Publications essentially upholds three ethical values in publications, namely (i) Neutrality, namely being free from conflicts of interest in managing publications; (ii) Justice, namely giving authorship rights to those entitled to be authors; and (iii) Honesty, namely free from duplication, fabrication, falsification and plagiarism in publications.

Review process

1. The author(s) submit the paper through the link provided in the website of The 5th APMRC 2024
2. The paper is checked for the suitable in scope, writing template, and language by the committee. Those are not suitable are returned to the authors for either resubmission or decline.
3. Two reviewers whose expertise relevant to the topic are assigned to a paper (double blind review).

4. The reviewers give decision, comments and suggestions to the paper's substances that possibly need to be revised.
5. The authors must access the reviewers' comments through the link provided, do all the revision, and resubmit the revised version on the predetermined date.
6. The authors present the paper on the conference.
7. The editor review the paper for its suitability with the journal and the proceeding guidelines. The editor of the journal has the authority to accept or reject the paper according to their policy. The scientific committee of the conference is responsible for reviewing the papers published on the proceeding. They act as editor of a journal and ensure that the papers are qualified for publication.
8. Following to the presentation on the conference, the committee sent a letter to the participants who choose to publish its article on the indexed proceeding.
9. The editor checks the compliance of the article to the template and the appropriateness of English in the writing. If it does not comply with either the template or the language, it will be sent back to the authors for revision until it really complies with the expectation.
10. The final manuscript then processed for layout according to the proceeding requirements including the information must be in an article.

Duties of Authors

1. Ensure that those included in the list of authors/authors meet the criteria as authors/writers.
2. Collectively responsible for the work and content of the article including methods, analysis, calculations and details.
3. State the origin of resources (including funding), either directly or indirectly.
4. Explain the limitations in the research
5. Respond to comments made by the reviewers in a professional and timely manner.
6. Inform the editor if you will withdraw your written work.
7. Make a statement that the written work submitted for publication is original, has never been published anywhere in any language, and is not in the process of being submitted to another publisher.

Duties of Editors

1. Ensure processes to maintain the quality of manuscript
2. Maintain the integrity of the author's academic track record.
3. Deliver corrections, clarifications, withdrawals, and apologies if necessary.
4. Has responsibility for organizing and formatting the paper, while the content and any statements in the paper are the responsibility of the author.
5. Assess published proceeding and attitudes of authors and peer reviewers to increase accountability and minimize errors.
6. Have an open-minded personality in accepting other people's new opinions or views that are different from their personal opinions.
7. Prohibits maintaining our own opinions, the author's or third parties' which may result in wrong decisions.
8. Encourage writers to make improvements to their written work until it is suitable for publication.

Duties of Reviewers

1. Receive an assignment from the editor to review written work and submit the results of the review to the editor, as material for determining the suitability of a written work for publication.
2. Reviewers may not carry out reviews of written works that involve themselves, either directly or indirectly
3. Maintain the author's privacy by not disseminating the results of corrections, suggestions and recommendations by providing criticism, suggestions, input and recommendations
4. Encourage authors/writers to make improvements to written work
5. Review written work that has been corrected according to predetermined standards.
6. Written works are reviewed in a timely manner according to the style of the publication environment based on scientific principles (data collection methods, legality of authors, conclusions, etc.).

3. Publication Ethics

Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement

This statement clarifies ethical behaviour of all parties involved in the act of publishing an article in this Proceeding, including the authors, the editors, the peer-reviewers and the publisher.

Ethical Guideline for Proceeding Publication

The publication of an article in a peer-reviewed Proceeding is an essential building block in the development of a coherent and respected network of knowledge. It is a direct reflection of the quality of the work of the authors and the institutions that support them. Peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. It is therefore important to agree upon standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in the act of publishing: the authors, the conference editors, the peer reviewers, the publisher and the society.

The 5th APMRC committee takes its duties of guardianship over all stages of publishing extremely seriously and we recognize our ethical and other responsibilities. We are committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint or other commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions.

Publication decisions

The 5th APMRC Committee are responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the proceeding should be published. The decision is based on the recommendation of the editorial board members and reviewers. The proceeding abides by legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editor confers with the editorial team and reviewers in making this decision.

Non-Discrimination

The editors and reviewers evaluate manuscripts for intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors.

Confidentiality

The editor, reviewers, and committee must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, editorial team, and the publisher, as appropriate.

Disclosure and conflicts of interest

Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used by any of the editorial board members and reviewers in their own research.

Confidentiality

Manuscript content is treated with at most confidentiality. The conference committee uses double blind process. Except for the editor-in-chief, the editors and reviewers cannot discuss paper with any other person, including the authors.

Standards of Objectivity

The editors and reviewers are required to evaluate papers based on the content. The review comment must be respectful of authors. The reviewers are required to justify their decision and recommendation.

Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

4. Plagiarism Policy

All work in the manuscript should be free of any plagiarism, falsification, fabrications, or omission of significant material. Every article submitted to the conference will be checked using Grammarly's and Turnitin plagiarism checker. Articles with a plagiarism result exceeding 20% will be rejected promptly. The author

can resubmit the article after he/she revises his/her work significantly. The editors will only process the article reaching below the 20% similarity limit.

Authors are expected to explicitly cite others' work and ideas, even if the work or ideas are not quoted verbatim or paraphrased. This standard applies whether the previous work is published, unpublished, or electronically available. Failure to properly cite the work of others may constitute plagiarism. Plagiarism in all forms constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

Redundancy (or "self-plagiarism") is an unacceptable publishing behaviour. Redundancy can occur in at least two ways: (1) Authors recycle portions of their previous writings by using identical or nearly identical sentences or paragraphs from earlier writings in subsequent research papers, without quotation or acknowledgement; or (2) Authors create multiple papers that are slight variations on each other, which are submitted for publication in different journals but without acknowledgement of the other papers.

Authors can and often do develop different aspects of an argument in more than one manuscript. However, manuscripts that differ primarily in appearance, but are presented as separate and distinct research without acknowledging other related work, constitute attempts (whether unintentional or deliberate) to deceive reviewers and readers by overinflating the intellectual contribution of the manuscript. Since publication decisions are influenced by the novelty and innovativeness of manuscripts, such deception is inappropriate and unethical.

If exact sentences or paragraphs that appear in another work by the Author are included in the manuscript, the material must be put in quotation marks and appropriately cited.

The corresponding author has responsibility to ensure that:

- The article is an original work and does not involve fraud, fabrication, or plagiarism.
- The article has not been published previously and is not currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. If accepted by the Proceeding, the article will not be submitted for publication to any other journal/Proceeding.
- The article contains no defamatory or unlawful statements and does not contain any materials that infringe upon individual privacy, proprietary rights, or any statutory copyright.
- They have written permission from owners for any excerpts from copyrighted works that are included and have credited the sources from where they were obtained.
- All authors are aware of and agree to the terms of this publishing agreement.
- Authors should check their manuscripts for possible breaches of copyright law (e.g., where permissions are needed for quotations, artwork or tables taken from other publications) and secure the necessary permissions before submission (Copyright Law).

5. Confidentiality

Editors of the 5th APMRC treat all submitted manuscripts and communication with authors and reviewers as confidential. It is expected that authors will also treat communication with the committee as confidential. Correspondence with the committee,

reviewers' reports, and other confidential material must not be posted on any website or otherwise publicized without prior permission from the editors, regardless of whether the submission is published or not.