



Peer-Review Statements

Manju Kaushik¹, Rajesh Prasad^{2*}, Sunita Jadhav², Sachin Chavan², Kailasnath Sutar², Harshada Mhetre²

¹ Amity University Rajasthan, Jaipur

² Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University), College of Engineering, Pune

*Editor-in-Chief of the **RRRAI-2026: Dr. Manju Kaushik.**
Email: mkaushik@jpr.amity.edu

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the International Conference on Responsible, Risk-Aware and Regulated Artificial Intelligence (RRRAI-2026) during 3-4th April 2026 in *Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University) College of Engineering, Pune*. 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 *adjudicated for type of review, double-blind*. Each submission was examined by *at least 2* reviewer(s) independently.

[If you use a conference or submission system mention it like for example: The conference submission management system was Conference Management Tool CMT3.]

[Please describe the overall process of review for your conference. 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 two reviewers.

[Any efforts in improving peer review should also appear in this section; for example, how reviewers are recused from the handling of papers by closely related authors, steps taken to reduce unconscious bias, etc.]

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. 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. *[You can add your own efforts to stop and detect plagiarism here as well]*

3. KEY METRICS

Total submissions	200
Number of articles sent for peer review	100
Number of accepted articles	45
Acceptance rate	22.5%
Number of reviewers	30

[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

[Competing interests refer to any interests of the Editor-in-Chief and/or members of the review body, that may or may be perceived to influence editorial decisions. It is normal to have interests, even competing ones, but the ethics of scientific publication demands that any competing interests be properly declared, and that appropriate steps be taken to uphold the validity of the editorial process in their presence.]

This is the proper section to document competing interests and the measures to address them. We show three examples here, and we encourage the organizers consult the Publisher’s and/or COPE guidelines for further information. In case of uncertainty, please contact the Publisher.

Example A (for no special interest): Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest.

Example B: Some of the authors (in this case, name them) were supervised by the Editor-in-Chief, who has recused herself from handling their submissions and has delegated them to colleagues with no personal interests in them.

Example C: The conference was partially funded by Acme, Inc., a company that has also supported or participated in some of the research submitted to the conference. All authors and reviewers are required to disclose their funding sources, and those research works that were funded by Acme have been reviewed by members of the Scientific Committee with no personal interests in the company.]

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.

