Peer-Review Statements

Reginald Hammah[1], Alison McQuillan[2], Thamer Yacoub[3], Sina Javankhoshdel[4]

[1,2,3,4] Rocscience Inc.

[1]Editor-in-Chief of the RIC2025. Email: reginald.hammah@rocscience.com

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *third Rocscience International Conference (RIC2025)* during *April 6-8, 2025* in *Sydney, Australia*. 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 *at least 2* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was EquinOCS

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 accepted if it had received favourable recommendations from at least 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.

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: evaluate whether papers have been previously published or whether they present novel material such as theorems, unique applications, new perspectives on a subject, etc.

2. Scientific Merit: submissions will be analyzed for whether they provide scientific value or whether they mainly promote a commercial product or company.

3. Fit with the Conference Theme: the review process will evaluate how well a submission fits into the conference's central theme.

4. Presentation Logic and Appropriate Referencing: reviewers will check how well arguments and statements made in submissions are laid out and substantiated/backed by appropriate technical references.

5. Presentation: reviewers will assess the quality of the English language used and the images, charts, and figures in a submission. This evaluation will also cover how these elements explain ideas or enhance readers' understanding. Papers that are easy to read and understand will receive good scores.

6. Completeness: reviewers will check a submission for whether it provides all essential ingredients such as references, figure captions, chart headers, axes labels, introductions, concluding statements or summaries, etc.

7. In addition, the publisher has checked all the articles for textual overlap to detect possible signs of plagiarism.

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	95
Number of articles sent for peer review	95
Number of accepted articles	65
Acceptance rate	68%
Number of reviewers	20

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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