



Peer-Review Statements

Jaime Caro¹, Shigeki Hagihara^{2*}, Shin-ya Nishizaki³,
Masayuki Numao⁴, Merlin Suarez⁵

¹ University of the Philippines Diliman

² Chitose Institute of Science and Technology

³ Institute of Science Tokyo

⁴ Kyoto Tachibana University

⁵ De La Salle University

*Editor-in-Chief of the WCTP2025. Email: s-hagiha@photon.chitose.ac.jp

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *Workshop on Computation: Theory and Practice (WCTP2025)* during *December 1st — 3rd, 2025* in *Chitose Arcadia Plaza, Chitose-city, Hokkaido, Japan*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Program 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 was Easychair.

The submissions were first screened for suitability for the scope of the conference. After the initial screening, they were sent for peer review by matching each paper's topic with the reviewers' expertise. A paper could only be considered for acceptance if it had received favourable recommendations from at least the two reviewers.

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

2. Clear description of the problem being addressed;
3. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
4. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
5. Clear assertion of the benefits of the results;
6. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
7. Clarity, cohesion, and accuracy in language and other modes of expression, including figures and tables.

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

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	57
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	57
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	33
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	58%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	31

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Competing interests was taken into consideration as follows:

- *Reviewers were not assigned to researchers who had collaborated with the author in the past or to researchers from the same university.*
- *All of the Acceptance/rejection were decided fairly in terms of peer review scores. Two borderline papers were judged carefully only by researchers from other universities with whom we have not collaborated in the past.*

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.

