Peer-Review Statements

S. Kannadhasan[1*], P. Sivakumar[2], T. Saravanan[3], S. Senthil Kumar[4]

[1] Professor, Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, Study World College of Engineering, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
[2] Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, K.S.R. College of Engineering, Tiruchengode, Namakkal, Tamil Nadu, India.
[3] Dean, Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, New Prince Shri Bhavani College of Engineering and Technology (NPSBCET), Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.
[4] Principal, New Prince Shri Bhavani College of Engineering and Technology (NPSBCET), Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

* Editor-in-Chief of the ICSICE-24. s.kannadasan@swehg.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the **International Conference on Sustainability Innovation in Computing and Engineering (ICSICE'24)** during **30th & 31st December 2024** at **New Prince Shri Bhavani College of Engineering & Technology, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India**. 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 **at least 2** reviewers independently. The conference submission management system used was **CMT**.

The review process followed these steps:

- A total of **387** submissions were received. After an initial screening for **basic quality and relevance**, **350** papers were sent for **peer review**.
- Each paper was assigned to **two reviewers** based on their expertise, ensuring that conflicts of interest were avoided.
- The **Technical Committee** monitored the review process to maintain fairness and uphold quality standards.
- A paper was considered for acceptance **only if both reviewers provided favorable recommendations**. In cases of conflicting reviews, an **Associate Editor** made the final decision.
- The peer review process was conducted by **35 expert reviewers**, ensuring a thorough and unbiased evaluation. To maintain integrity, reviewers were recused from handling papers

© The Author(s) 2025
S. Kannadhasan et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainability Innovation in Computing and Engineering (ICSICE 24)*, Advances in Computer Science Research 120,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-718-2_1

where conflicts of interest existed, and **double-blind anonymity** was enforced to reduce unconscious bias.

- Ultimately, **164 papers** were accepted for presentation at the conference.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

1. **Evaluation Criteria**
   Reviewers were instructed to assess submissions **solely based on academic merit** using the following criteria, ranked by importance:
   1. **Relevance to the conference themes and scope** – ensuring alignment with the key topics of discussion.
   2. **Originality, novelty, and timeliness** – evaluating the contribution of new ideas, advancements, and significance in the field.
   3. **Methodological soundness** – assessing the validity of research methods, quality of analysis, and reliability of results.
   4. **Adherence to ethical standards** – ensuring compliance with ethical guidelines, research integrity, and responsible conduct.
   5. **Clarity and presentation** – reviewing coherence of writing, logical flow, and accuracy in figures, tables, and references.
2. **Plagiarism Detection & Ethical Compliance**
   - All submissions underwent **plagiarism checks** using the publisher's detection system.
   - Papers with excessive textual overlap were **reviewed by the Technical Committee**.
   - Submissions found to have **high similarity** were either **rejected outright** or returned to authors for citation and revision before reconsideration.
3. **Fairness & Transparency in Peer Review**
   - Each paper was reviewed **independently** by at least **two reviewers** following a **double-blind** process.
   - Reviewers were required to **recuse themselves** if they had conflicts of interest with the authors or content.
   - The **Technical Committee** closely monitored the process to ensure fairness, quality, and adherence to review standards.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	387
Number of articles sent for peer review	350
Number of accepted articles	164
Acceptance rate	42.37%
Number of reviewers	35

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Technical Committee declares any competing interests that could influence the editorial decisions for ICSICE'24.

To ensure transparency and fairness, the following measures were implemented:

Conflict of Interest Handling

Reviewers and editors were required to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to authors or submitted research.
If an editor or reviewer had a personal, academic, or financial connection to an author, they were recused from handling that submission.
Industry & Funding Disclosure

Authors were required to disclose funding sources in their submissions.
If a submission was partially funded by an external organization, it was assigned to reviewers with no affiliations or competing interests in that organization.
Editorial Oversight

The Technical Committee closely monitored the peer review process to ensure integrity and unbiased decision-making.
Any concerns regarding undisclosed competing interests were reviewed and addressed according to COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) guidelines.

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.