



Peer-Review Statements

Gábor Szabó-Szentgróti*
Széchenyi István University
Kautz Faculty of Business and Economics
Department of Corporate Leadership and Marketing
Győr, Hungary
Email: szabo-szentgroti.gabor@sze.hu

Amanda Cecil
Purdue University
School of Hospitality and Tourism Management
West Lafayette, Indiana, United States
Email: akcecil@iu.edu

Jessica Lichy
IDRAC Business School
Lyon, France
Email: jessica.lichy1@idrac-bs.fr

Marco Cucculelli
Università Politecnica delle Marche
Department of Economics and Social Sciences
Ancona, Italy
Email: m.cucculelli@staff.univpm.it

Sándor Remsei
Széchenyi István University
Kautz Faculty of Business and Economics
Department of International and Applied Economics
Győr, Hungary
Email: remsei.sandor@sze.hu

Eszter Lukács
Széchenyi István University
Kautz Faculty of Business and Economics
Department of International and Applied Economics
Győr, Hungary
Email: eszter@sze.hu

*Editor-in-Chief of the Kautz Conference. Email: szabo-szentgroti.gabor@sze.hu

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *Kautz Conference on Business and Economics* during 8-10 October, 2025 in Győr, Hungary. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Scientific Committee* and approved by the Chair *Scientific*

Committee, 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 *at least 1* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Open Journal System.

Incoming manuscripts are screened for compliance with fundamental and formal requirements (<https://kautzconference.sze.hu/guidelines>). Manuscripts that fail to meet the guidelines are rejected prior to peer review. Manuscripts that are improperly prepared are returned to the authors for correction and resubmission. Following these preliminary checks, the responsible editor—or, in cases of conflict of interest, a member of the Scientific Committee—determines whether the manuscript fits the scope of the conference and is scientifically sound. At this stage, the significance or potential impact of the work is not assessed. Rejection decisions made at this stage are verified by the Chair of the Scientific Committee.

Reviewer Recommendations

Authors may suggest potential reviewers. The editorial team ensures that no conflicts of interest exist before contacting reviewers, and suggestions involving conflicts of interest are not considered. Reviewers are asked to disclose any potential conflicts of interest. At the initial submission stage, authors may also indicate individuals whom they prefer not to be involved in the review of their manuscript. The editorial office respects such requests, provided they do not compromise an objective and thorough evaluation of the submission.

Peer Review

Once the manuscript has passed the initial checks, the handling editor invites at least two independent experts to review it. These experts may also include members of the Scientific Committee.

The conference proceedings employ a double-blind peer review process. Reviews are confidential and may only be disclosed with the explicit consent of the reviewer. The editor decides on acceptance or rejection of manuscripts, with the final decision resting with the Chair of the Scientific Committee.

The selection of reviewers may take into account author suggestions; however, these are subject to strict scrutiny in accordance with journal policy: potential reviewers must not have co-authored publications with the authors within the past five years and must not currently be affiliated with the same institution.

Editorial Decision and Revisions

All papers published in the conference proceedings undergo peer review and receive at least one referee report. The editor communicates one of the following decisions:

- **Acceptance:** The paper is accepted without changes.
- **Acceptance after minor revisions:** The paper is accepted in principle, pending corrections in line with reviewer comments. Authors are given one week to complete minor revisions.
- **Resubmission after major revisions:** Acceptance is conditional on substantial modifications. Authors must respond point-by-point to reviewer comments, or provide justified rebuttals where revisions cannot be made. Generally, only one round of major revisions is permitted. Authors are requested to resubmit the revised manuscript within two weeks, after which it will be returned to the reviewers for further comments.
- **Rejection:** The paper contains serious flaws or lacks original contribution, and is therefore rejected without recommendation for resubmission.

Authors must respond point-by-point to all reviewer comments. In cases of disagreement, authors are expected to provide clear and reasoned responses.

Appeals

Authors may appeal a rejection by sending a detailed justification via email to the editorial office. The appeal must include a point-by-point response to the reviewers' and/or editor's comments. The Editor-in-Chief forwards the manuscript and all related materials (including reviewer identities) to a member of the Scientific Committee. If no suitable committee member is available, an appropriate external expert is appointed. The committee member provides an advisory recommendation on the manuscript, which may include acceptance, further peer review, or upholding the original rejection. At this stage, a rejection decision is final and cannot be reversed.

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:

- ***Novelty and originality of the research*** - *The research contains new, valuable scientific results/contributes to existing knowledge.*
- ***Relevance to the objectives of the journal*** - *The content and theme of the study is relevant to the objectives and theme of the journal.*

- **Quality of the literature** - The paper presents and uses the main literature relevant to the topic in an appropriate way and analyses/evaluates it with scientific rigor.
- **Appropriate use of citations** - The paper appropriately cites the works cited, applying a consistent citation style.
- **Methodological rigor** - The methods and calculations used in the research are appropriate and justified.
- **Clarity and relevance of results** - Results are presented clearly and are related to the research question.
- **Relevance of conclusions** - The conclusions are well-supported and consistent with the results.
- **Quality of communication** - The language of the study is clear, understandable, and grammatically correct.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. *Plagiarism screening was conducted using Turnitin to ensure originality and proper citation of sources.*

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	89
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	39
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	22
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	24,7%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	41

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.

