

Peer Review Policy

Achievers International Campus

Global Conference for Multidisciplinary Research 2026 (GCMR)

1. Purpose of Peer Review

The peer review process is designed to ensure the academic quality, rigor, relevance, and integrity of submissions presented at the Achievers International Campus Global Conference for Multidisciplinary Research (GCMR) 2026. All eligible submissions will undergo a fair, thorough, and constructive review process to support high academic standards and ensure that accepted research makes a meaningful contribution to the conference.

2. Review Process

2.1 Initial Screening

All submissions will undergo an initial screening by the editorial team to determine whether they comply with the conference scope, submission requirements, formatting standards, and relevant ethical guidelines.

Submissions that do not meet the basic requirements or that raise significant ethical concerns, including evidence of plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct, may be rejected at this stage and will not proceed to peer review.

2.2 Double-Blind Peer Review

GCMR follows a double-blind peer review process to promote impartiality, objectivity, and confidentiality.

Under this process:

- Reviewers will not be provided with information identifying the authors.
- Authors will not be informed of the identities of the reviewers.
- Authors and reviewers are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the review process.

2.3 Assignment of Reviewers

Each submission will normally be assigned to at least two independent reviewers with appropriate expertise in the relevant academic or professional field.

Reviewers will be selected based on their academic qualifications, research experience, subject expertise, and familiarity with the topic or methodology of the submission. Where appropriate, submissions may be assigned to additional reviewers to support a fair and informed editorial decision.

3. Evaluation Criteria

Reviewers will assess submissions against relevant academic and scholarly criteria, including:

- Originality and Novelty: The extent to which the research presents original ideas, findings, approaches, or perspectives.
- Relevance: The alignment of the research with the themes and scope of GCMR.
- Objectives and Research Questions: The clarity, coherence, and appropriateness of the research objectives and questions.
- Methodological Rigor: The suitability, validity, and clarity of the research design, methods, analysis, and interpretation of results.
- Contribution to Knowledge: The significance of the research in extending, challenging, or contributing to existing knowledge.
- Practical Implications: The relevance and potential application of the findings to professional, organizational, societal, or other appropriate contexts.
- Presentation Quality: The overall organization, clarity, academic language, referencing, formatting, and presentation of the submission.

Reviewers should provide sufficient comments and recommendations to assist the authors in strengthening their work where revisions are required.

4. Reviewer Recommendations

Following evaluation, reviewers may recommend one of the following outcomes:

- Accept without Revisions: The submission meets the required academic and presentation standards and requires no substantive changes.
- Accept with Minor Revisions: The submission is suitable for acceptance subject to limited corrections or improvements.
- Revise and Resubmit: Substantial revisions are required before the submission can be considered for acceptance.
- Reject: The submission does not meet the required academic, methodological, ethical, or presentation standards.

Reviewer recommendations will contribute to the editorial decision but will not, by themselves, determine the final outcome.

5. Responsibilities of Reviewers

Reviewers are expected to:

- Provide objective, fair, respectful, and constructive feedback.
- Evaluate submissions based on their academic merit and the established review criteria.
- Identify potential ethical concerns, including plagiarism, research misconduct,

or other issues that may affect the integrity of the work.

- Declare any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest.
- Complete reviews within the specified timeframe.
- Maintain the confidentiality of the submission and all information obtained through the review process.
- Refrain from using or sharing unpublished information contained in a submission for personal or professional purposes.

6. Editorial Decisions

The final decision regarding the acceptance, revision, or rejection of each submission will be made by the editorial team after considering the reviewers' evaluations and recommendations.

Authors will be informed of the editorial decision within the designated communication period. Where revisions are required, relevant reviewer and editorial comments will be provided to guide the authors in addressing the identified concerns.

7. Conflict of Interest

Reviewers and members of the editorial team must disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest that could affect their impartiality.

A reviewer should not participate in the review of a submission where a conflict of interest may compromise, or reasonably appear to compromise, the objectivity of the review. Where necessary, the submission will be reassigned to another suitably qualified reviewer.

8. Appeals and Revisions

Authors may appeal an editorial decision by submitting a written justification that clearly explains the grounds for the appeal and provides relevant supporting evidence.

Appeals will be considered by the editorial team and, where appropriate, referred to an independent or separate panel of reviewers. The outcome of an appeal will be based on the academic and procedural merits of the case.

Where revisions are requested, authors are expected to address the reviewers' comments comprehensively and submit a revised version within the specified timeframe. Revised submissions may undergo further review to determine whether the identified concerns have been adequately addressed.

9. Acknowledgment of Reviewers

The valuable contributions of reviewers to maintaining the academic quality and integrity of GCMR will be appropriately acknowledged in the conference proceedings or through other suitable means.

Such acknowledgment will be provided without compromising the confidentiality of the double-blind peer review process or disclosing the identities of reviewers in connection with individual submissions.