

Peer-Review Statements

Michal Petrů^{1,*} Petr Lepšík¹ Ladislav Ševčík¹ Pavel Srb¹

¹Technical University of Liberec, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

*Editor-in-Chief of the ICMD2022. Email: michal.petru@tul.cz

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the ICMD2022 during 13th to 15th September 2022 in Harrachov. 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 single-blind. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewers independently.

The reviews were single-blind. Each submission was examined by 2 reviewers independently. The first assessment has been carried out during registering for the conference, contributions were evaluated based on the title and abstract. If the abstract was not evaluated as thematically appropriate for the conference, the registration was rejected and the manuscript was not sent.

After the accepted registrations the submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitableness. After the initial screening, they were sent for peer review by matching each paper's topic with the reviewers' expertise, considering 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.

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. Originality
- 2. Contribution to The Field
- 3. Technical Quality
- 4. Clarity of Presentation

2 M. Petr et al.

- 5. Depth of Research
- 6. Manuscript's structure according to the Instruction to the authors
- 7. Appropriate references

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

3. KEY METRICS

Number of articles sent for peer review 95

Number of accepted articles 49

Acceptance rate 46.7 %

Number of reviewers 36

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Some of the reviewers were also authors or co-authors of the manuscripts. These were taken out from handling their manuscripts and has delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.

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.

