Peer-Review Statements

Shilpa Bhalerao*, Praveen Gupta[2], Vandana Kate[3]

*,2,3Acropolis Institute of Technology and Research, Indore, MP, India

*Editor-in-Chief of the RAMSITA-2025 Email: ramsita@acropolis.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *International Conference on Recent Advancement and Modernization in Sustainable Intelligent Technologies & Applications(RAMSITA-2025)* during *February, 7,8, 2025*in *Indore, MP, India.* These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the review committee :*Dr. Anil Gupta, Dr. Anish Kumar Choudhary, Dr. Arpan Shrivastava, Dr. Ayesha Butalia, Dr. Chirag Joshi, Dr. PritikaBahad, Dr. Reetu Gupta, Prof. Garima Joshi, Prof. Geeta Santhosh, Dr. Juhi-Kamakoty, Dr. K. Venkatesh Sharma, Dr. KirtiMuley, Dr. Leena Y. Bhole, Dr. Maya Ingle, Dr. Nalini N, Dr. PreetiSaxena, Dr. RathanCh Kumar, Dr. Shraddha Masih, Dr. Richa Gupta, Dr. Ritesh Joshi, Dr. Smriti Jain, Dr. Subhash N Chandra, Dr. SurabhiAnuradha, Dr. Suresh Jain, Dr. TejaswiniApte, Dr. Vasima Khan, Dr. Gaurav Chaitnaya, Dr. Jayant Awasthi, Dr. Kamlesh Gupta*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 *open*. Each submission was examined by *at least 2* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was CMT (https://cmt3.research.microsoft.com/RAMSITA2025/Submission/Index).

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitableness. After the initial screening, plagiarism check from professional software is performed. Paper with plagiarism less than 20% 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. In case, if recommendations from reviewers are conflicting then paper is assigned to third reviewer for final recommendations of paper

Authors of a rejected submission were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. Paper is again peer reviewed and if

found as per quality standard then only the acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

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 *[Note: please summarise your criteria and order them by importance; the following list is an example]*:

1. Relevance: Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;

2. Originality and novelty:Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;

3. Technical Quality: Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;

4. Plagiarism check: Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;

5. Clarity and Presentation: Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

6. Reviewer Remarks: Reviewer remarks are also filled to improve the quality of the paper.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. We checked plagiarism of the paper at least *[You can add your own efforts to stop and detect plagiarism here as well]*

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	437
Number of articles sent for peer review	414
Number of accepted articles	85
Acceptance rate	20.53%
Number of reviewers	29

[Any additional information about article statistics belongs to this section, but the listing should suffice in most situations. More rows can be added if necessary, but please do not delete any existing row. Numbers are for example only. "Acceptance rate" is (number of accepted articles) divided by (number of total submissions).]

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Some paper are desk rejected duet high plagiarism. lack of ethical standards.

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