

Peer-Review Statements

Vishnu Agarwal^(⊠), Rupika Sinha, and Joyabrata Mal

MNNIT Allahabad, Prayagraj 211004, India vishnua@mnnit.ac.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *Biosangam* 2022 during *March 10–12*, 2022 in *Prayagraj*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Review 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 *two* reviewer(s) independently.

The submissions were first screened rigorously for generic quality and suitableness and then invited. 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.

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

The reviewers did not share common affiliations to that of authors. Example: Papers from authors belonging to MNNIT Allahabad were sent to reviewers from other institutes.

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.

V. Agarwal—Editors-in-Chief of the Biosangam 2022.

3 Key Metrics

Total submissions	168
Number of articles sent for peer	30
review	
Number of accepted articles	26
Acceptance rate	15.5%
Number of reviewers	16

4 Competing Interests

Some of the authors were supervised by the Editor-in-Chief, who has recused himself from handling their submissions and has delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.

Name of such authors:

- 1. Akshat Gupta
- 2. Anmol Srivastava
- 3. Nidhi Verma
- 4. Jyoti Srivastava

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits 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.

