



Peer-Review Statements

Manmohan Shrma^{1,*}

Sophiya Sheikh^{1,*}

Amar Singh^{1,*}

Mintu Nath^{2,*}

¹ Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab, India – 144411.

² University of Aberdeen, Scotland, United Kingdom - AB24 3FX

*Editor-in-Chief of the [RACS-2025]. Email: sophiya.sheikh@gmail.com


All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *International Conference on Recent Advances in Computing Sciences – RACS-2025* during [25-04-2025 – 26-04-2025] in [Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab, India - 144411]. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the [Conference 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

To evaluate the scientific papers submitted for presentation in the RACS-2025 will be gone through the double-blind peer review process. A group of experts with expertise in fields within the scope of the conference, named as “Technical Program Committee” is appointed by the Technical Program Chair to evaluate the scientific papers to make sure that a paper meets all the standards for acceptance, presentation, and publication.

- The Technical Program Committee collaborates to review and access the submitted papers.
- Papers accepted by the Conference Review Committee sent to two reviewers at least.
- Review will be done using a double-blind peer review process (neither the author nor the reviewers are aware of each other's identity).
- Review must be completed during a fixed window of time.
- Based on the positive or negative decision of both the reviewers authors are notified of the decision on their paper at the same time.

- Authors of a accepted with revision decision are given the opportunity to revise and resubmit after addressing the reviewers' comments.
- The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final and the Technical Program Chair is ultimately responsible for the selection of every accepted paper.



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:

- **Originality and Novelty:** Evaluation of whether the manuscript offers a distinct conceptual contribution, introduces novel methodologies, or provides significant advancements beyond existing literature.
- **Methodological Rigor:** Assessment of the research design, experimental setup, data collection, and analytical techniques to ensure they are robust, reproducible, and technically sound.
- **Theoretical Framework and Literature Integration:** Review of how effectively the study builds upon established theories and accurately contextualizes its hypotheses within the current state of the art.
- **Clarity of Argument and Presentation:** Examination of the structural flow, logical consistency, clarity of technical writing, and the precise presentation of data through figures, tables, or pseudocode.
- **Significance and Impact:** Analysis of the practical, theoretical, or industrial relevance of the findings, and their potential to meaningfully influence future research or applications in the field.
- **Ethical Compliance and Integrity:** Verification that the research adheres to academic integrity standards, including proper citations, data transparency, and appropriate conflict-of-interest disclosures.
- **Plagiarism Detection and Academic Integrity:** A plagiarism report using Turnitin is provided to the reviewers. Reviewers assess whether the work meets acceptable similarity thresholds and adheres strictly to scholarly ethics, ensuring that any overlapping content is legally and academically justified.

To ensure an objective and impartial evaluation, reviewers were explicitly directed to focus entirely on the scholarly value and technical integrity of the submitted work within these defined parameters, discounting all non-merit factors.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	258
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	245
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	26
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	10.61%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	70

[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

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.

