



Peer-Review Statements

Laeq R. Janjua¹, Kozma Dorottya Edina²

Hammouch Hind³, Kittisak WONGMAHESAK⁴

Prof. (Dr.) Rhishikesh Dave⁵, Prof. (Dr.) Madhuri Parikh⁶

Prof. (Dr.) Bhupinder Singh⁷, Prof. (Dr.) Rahul J. Nikam⁸

Dr. Razia Chauhan⁹, Dr. Aqsa. S. Fatima¹⁰

¹ WSB University, Poland

² University of Pannonia, Hungary

³ University Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah. Fez. Morocco

⁴ North Bangkok University, Thailand

⁵ Sharda School of Law, Sharda University

⁶ Institute of Law, Nirma Universit

⁷ Sharda School of Law, Sharda University

⁸ Sharda School of Law, Sharda University

⁹ Sharda School of Law, Sharda University

¹⁰ Sharda School of Law, Sharda University

Prof. (Dr.) Rhishikesh Dave (Editor-in-chief) [ICAR 2026].

Email: rhishikesh.dave@sharda.ac.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the [ICAR 2026] during [“16th and 17th January 2026”] in [India]. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Scientific Evaluation 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 [3] reviewer(s) independently.

[If you use a conference or submission system mention it like for example: The conference submission management system was EquinOCS/EasyChair/etc.]

The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability. After the initial screening, they 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 three 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. Pertinence of the article's content to the scope and themes of the conference;
- 2. Clear demonstration of originality, novelty, and timeliness of the research;
- 3. Soundness of the methods, analyses, and results;
- 4. Adherence to the ethical standards and codes of conduct relevant to the research field;
- 5. 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. *Articles checked in Turnitin software and the Similarity and A.I reports are also shared.*

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	102
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	89
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	23
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	22.55%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	03

4. COMPETING INTERESTSNEITHER 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.

