



Peer-Review Statements

A. Shirly Edward¹, Rahul Krishnan², P. Nagarajan³, Anju M I⁴, Muzammil Bin Jusoh⁵

^{1,2,3,4} SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Vadapalani Campus, Chennai, India

⁵ Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia.

*Editor-in-Chief of the ICARECS 2025. Email: rahulk1@srmist.edu.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *International Conference on Advanced Research in Electronics and Communication Systems, ICARECS 2025* during 26th and 27th February 2025 in SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Vadapalani Campus, Chennai. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Technical 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 *single-blind*. Each submission was examined by *two* reviewers independently.

The conference submission management system was Microsoft CMT.

Authors of a rejected submission were allowed to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final. The submissions to ICARECS were first screened for basic quality, originality, and relevance to the conference themes. Manuscripts that met these initial criteria were then forwarded for peer review, with reviewers assigned based on subject-matter expertise and absence of any competing interests.

The conference followed a single-blind review process, ensuring that the reviewers remained anonymous to the authors to help reduce bias. Each paper was reviewed by at least two independent experts. Reviewers evaluated submissions on the basis of technical merit, clarity of presentation, novelty, and relevance to the conference theme.

© The Author(s) 2025

A. S. Edward et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advanced Research in Electronics and Communication Systems (ICARECS 2025)*, Atlantis Highlights in Engineering 38,

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-754-0_1

A paper was considered for acceptance only if it received favourable recommendations from the majority of its reviewers. In cases where conflicting reviews were received, the paper was sent for an additional round of evaluation or arbitration by a member of the Technical Program Committee (Meta Reviewer).

Authors of submissions that required revisions were invited to resubmit after addressing all reviewer comments. The final decision on the revised manuscript was made based on the extent to which reviewer concerns were addressed. The acceptance or rejection of the revised submission was final.

To maintain a fair and unbiased review process, reviewers were recused from evaluating submissions with which they had any conflict of interest, including personal or institutional ties to the authors. Additional efforts to improve review quality and reduce unconscious bias included providing reviewers with guidelines for constructive feedback and anonymizing author details wherever feasible.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers for ICARECS were instructed to assess each submission solely on the basis of academic merit, following a structured set of evaluation criteria. The key dimensions—ordered by importance—were as follows:

1. **Relevance to the Conference Themes:** The degree to which the submission aligned with the core topics of ICARECS.
2. **Originality and Novelty:** Using Turnitin software ensures the plagiarism and AI level for initial screening. The presence of innovative ideas, techniques, or perspectives, as well as the timeliness of the research in addressing current challenges.
3. **Scientific Rigor and Methodological Soundness:** The use of valid, well-established methods and a clear, logical presentation of results and analysis.
4. **Ethical Integrity:** Adherence to recognized ethical guidelines and professional codes of conduct in research, including proper citations and data transparency.
5. **Presentation Quality:** The clarity, structure, and coherence of the manuscript, including the use of precise language, well-labeled figures/tables, and consistent formatting.

To uphold academic integrity, all submissions were checked for textual overlap using advanced plagiarism detection tools. Any paper showing significant similarity with previously published work was subjected to further scrutiny. In such cases, the Technical Committee contacted the authors for clarification or supporting evidence of originality.

As an additional safeguard, ICARECS implemented internal measures to discourage unethical practices, including:

- Requiring authors to submit a signed declaration of originality and authorship.
- Enforcing strict rejection policies for papers found to have plagiarized, duplicated, or manipulated content.
- Educating reviewers on best practices in identifying unethical writing and data presentation.

These combined efforts aimed to ensure the academic quality, integrity, and fairness of the review process.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	269
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	188
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	76
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	28.2%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	27

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Technical Review Committee declares any competing interests that could have influenced the editorial or review decisions for ICARECS. The peer review and acceptance processes were conducted with full transparency and in adherence to ethical standards outlined by the Publisher's 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.

