

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

The International Conference on Business and Information (ICBI 2025) is dedicated to promoting academic integrity and scholarly excellence. We uphold the highest ethical standards in the submission, review, and publication processes. All participants, including authors, reviewers, editors, and conference organizers—are expected to comply with these ethical guidelines, which are aligned with the recommendations of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

1. Author Responsibilities

1.1. Originality and Ethical Conduct

Authors must submit original work that has not been published elsewhere or is under consideration by another conference or journal. Submissions must not include plagiarized or unethically generated content.

1.2. Plagiarism and AI Screening

All submissions are checked via Turnitin. Thresholds are:

- Plagiarism: Must not exceed 30%
- AI-generated content: Must not exceed 20%

Manuscripts breaching these thresholds may be desk-rejected or returned for revision at editorial discretion.

1.3. Authorship and Contribution

Only individuals who have made substantial contributions to the work should be listed as authors. All authors must approve the final manuscript and consent to submission.

1.4. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Authors must declare any financial, institutional, or personal conflicts of interest that could influence the research.

1.5. Human and Data Ethics

Research involving human subjects, sensitive data, or ethical approvals must adhere to relevant institutional and international standards (e.g., informed consent, data protection).

1.6. Corrections and Retractions

Authors are expected to promptly notify the editorial board of any major errors post-submission or publication. The conference reserves the right to issue corrections, clarifications, or retractions if necessary.

2. Reviewer Responsibilities

2.1. Confidentiality

Reviewers must treat all materials and communications related to the manuscript as confidential. Manuscripts should not be shared or discussed with anyone outside the review process.

2.2. Objectivity and Fairness

Reviews must be conducted in an unbiased, constructive, and respectful manner. Personal criticism of authors is inappropriate. Feedback should focus on the content, quality, and contribution of the work.

2.3. Expert Evaluation

Reviewers should only accept assignments for which they have sufficient subject expertise. They must assess the manuscript's originality, methodology, clarity, accuracy, and relevance to the conference theme.

2.4. Timely Review

Reviewers are expected to submit their evaluations within the agreed-upon deadline. Delays should be communicated in advance to the editorial team.

2.5. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers must immediately inform the editorial team if they identify any personal, professional, or institutional conflicts of interest with the authors or content.

2.6. No Use of AI for Confidential Content

Reviewers must not upload manuscripts or confidential content to generative AI tools. If AI assistance is used (e.g., for grammar support or summaries), this must be declared in the review submission.

2.7. Acknowledgment of Effort

By participating in the peer review process, reviewers contribute to the advancement of academic knowledge and will be recognized accordingly, including optional crediting via ORCID.

3. Editorial and Committee Responsibilities

3.1. Impartial Decision-Making

Editorial decisions are based solely on academic merit and relevance to the conference themes. Editors must not be influenced by race, gender, institutional affiliation, or political views.

3.2. Peer Review Management

Editors ensure that all manuscripts undergo a rigorous double-blind peer review process. They assign at least two qualified reviewers to each manuscript, ensuring no conflicts of interest.

3.3. Reviewer Selection

Reviewers are selected based on qualifications (e.g., Master's/PhD, minimum citation thresholds), subject-matter expertise, and review experience. Editors verify reviewer credentials using institutional emails and ORCID/Scopus IDs.

3.4. Conflict of Interest Oversight

Editors ensure that no individual is involved in the review of their own work or that of close colleagues. Authors with dual roles (e.g., editors submitting papers) are subject to independent review by unconflicted editors.

3.5. Handling of Ethical Breaches

In cases of suspected misconduct (e.g., plagiarism, falsified data), editors are responsible for initiating investigations and taking corrective actions, including retractions or notifying institutions.

4. Misconduct, Sanctions, and Ethical Oversight

4.1. Allegations of Misconduct

ICBI 2025 will investigate all allegations of misconduct (e.g., plagiarism, data fabrication, duplicate submission) thoroughly. Outcomes may include rejection, retraction, or notification to affiliated institutions.

4.2. Ethical Compliance Checks

The desk review stage includes ethical compliance screening for scope alignment, formatting, plagiarism, and AI use.

4.3. Post-Publication Updates

Corrections or retractions will be issued where needed to maintain the scholarly integrity of the proceedings.