

Peer-Review Statements

Zheng Xu^{1,*}

¹ Shanghai Polytechnic University

*Editor-in-Chief of the [STSIOT 2021]. Email: zhengxu@shu.edu.cn

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [STSIOT 2021] during [Dec. 19, 2021] in [online conference due to COVID-19]. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Scientific Committee] and approved by the Editor-in-Chief, 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 [2] reviewer(s) independently.

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. After the initial screening, they were sent for peer review by matching each paper's topic with the reviewers' expertise, taking into account any competing interests. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it had received favourable recommendations from the two reviewers.

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:

1. Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;
2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
3. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
4. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
5. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	310
Number of articles sent for peer review	300
Number of accepted articles	71
Acceptance rate	24.1%
Number of reviewers	40

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest.