



Peer-Review Statements

Shilpa Bhalerao^{1*}, Praveen Gupta², Vandana Kate³

^{1,2,3}Acropolis Institute of Technology and Research, Indore, MP, India

¹Editor-in-Chief of the RAMSITA-2026 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-2026)* during February, 6,7, 2026 in Indore, MP, India. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the review committee : *Dr. Duc-Tan Tran, Dr. Anand Singh Jalal, Dr. Anil Gupta, Dr. Anish Kumar Choudhary, Dr. Arpan Shrivastava, Dr. Ayesha Butalia, Dr. Anupama Jain, Dr. Pritika Bahad, Dr. Reetu Gupta, Dr. Garima Joshi, Prof. Geeta Santhosh, Dr. Kirti Muley, Dr. Leena Y. Bhole, Dr. Maya Ingle, Dr. Nalini N, Dr. Preeti Saxena, Dr. Wasima Khan, Dr. Anand Gadwal, Dr. Shraddha Masih, Dr. Richa Gupta, Dr. Ritesh Joshi, Dr. Smriti Jain, Dr. Booma Jayapalan, Dr. Suresh Jain, Dr. Tejaswini Apte, Dr. Gaurav Chaitnaya, Dr. Jayant Awasthi, Dr. Kamlesh Gupta, Dr. Manoj Agrawal, Dr. Ashish Valuskar, Dr. Jaya Kumari*, 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/RAMSITA2026/Submission/Inde>).

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. 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 3 times for each paper first after the submission of the paper, second at resubmission of after reviewer's comments and third time after camera ready submissions. [*You can add your own efforts to stop and detect plagiarism here as well*]

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	355
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	355
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	46
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	12.95%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	32

[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.

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.

