



# Peer-Review Statements

Sanjeev Kumar<sup>1,\*</sup> Sumit Bhardwaj<sup>1</sup> Shilpi Jindal<sup>1</sup> Surjeet Chahal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics, University Institute of Sciences, Chandigarh University, Mohali  
140413, India

<sup>2</sup> University Centre for Research and Development, Chandigarh University, Mohali  
140413, India

\*Editor-in-Chief of the [ICAM DFA-2024]. Email: sanjeev.uis@cumail.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [ICAM DFA-2024] during [4-5 October] in [Mohali, India]. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Scientific 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 [open]. Each submission was examined by [2] reviewer(s) independently.

All submitted manuscripts were initially screened for quality, originality, and relevance to the scope of the publication. Suitable papers were then sent for peer review by experts whose research expertise matched the manuscript topic, while ensuring that no conflicts of interest existed.

A manuscript was considered for acceptance only after receiving favourable recommendations from two independent reviewers. Authors of rejected or revision-required manuscripts were given an opportunity to revise and resubmit their work after addressing the reviewers' comments. The final decision on acceptance or rejection was made after evaluation of the revised submission.

To maintain fairness and transparency, reviewers with potential conflicts of interest were excluded from the review process, and all manuscripts were evaluated through an impartial and confidential peer-review system.

## 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

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

1. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
2. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
3. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
4. 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>                       | 173    |
| <i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i> | 40     |
| <i>Number of accepted articles</i>             | 21     |
| <i>Acceptance rate</i>                         | 52.5 % |
| <i>Number of reviewers</i>                     | 15     |

### 4. COMPETING INTERESTS

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.

