



Peer-Review Statements

Mridula Singh^{1,*}, Md Iqbal¹, Karan Singh²,
Shahnawaz Khan³, Sourabh Jain⁴

¹ Quantum University, Roorkee, India

² Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

³ Bahrain Polytechnic, Bahrain

⁴ IIIT Sonapat, Sonapat, Haryana

*Editor-in-Chief of the ICIPAI-2026

Email: mridula.cse@quantumeducation.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *International Conference on Innovation and Practices in Artificial Intelligence, ICIPAI-2026* during *15-16 May 2026* in *Quantum University, Roorkee*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Program 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 *three* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission and review process was managed using the **Springer Nature Meteor Submission System**.

All submitted manuscripts first underwent an initial editorial screening to verify their relevance to the conference themes, compliance with the publisher's formatting guidelines, completeness of submission, and adherence to ethical and plagiarism policies. Manuscripts that successfully passed the initial screening were assigned to reviewers based on their domain expertise while ensuring the absence of any potential conflicts of interest. Authors of submissions for which revisions were requested were given the opportunity to revise and resubmit their manuscript after addressing the reviewers' comments; a number of papers underwent more than one round of revision before a

final decision was reached. The acceptance or rejection of a revised manuscript was final.

Reviewers assessed each submission independently and provided detailed comments along with recommendations regarding acceptance, revision, or rejection. Authors of papers requiring revisions were invited to address all reviewer comments and submit a revised manuscript. The revised submissions were carefully examined by the handling editors and, where necessary, re-evaluated by the original reviewers before a final editorial decision was made.

To maintain the highest standards of publication ethics, reviewers and editors were required to maintain strict confidentiality throughout the review process. Editorial decisions were based solely on the scientific merit, originality, technical quality, and relevance of the submitted work. Reviewers with any actual or perceived conflict of interest were recused from evaluating the concerned manuscripts.

To further enhance the fairness and integrity of the peer-review process, reviewer assignments were primarily based on subject expertise while taking potential conflicts of interest into consideration. **In cases where a potential conflict of interest was identified**, such as papers authored by close collaborators or colleagues from the same institution, the concerned reviewer was recused from the review process, and the manuscript was reassigned to an independent reviewer. The double-blind review process helped minimize unconscious bias by concealing the identities of both authors and reviewers during the evaluation. Editorial decisions were based solely on the scientific merit, originality, technical quality, and relevance of the submitted work. For a few borderline submissions, the Editorial Committee held discussions before reaching a final decision to ensure consistency and fairness in the review process.

2. QUALITY CRITERIA

Reviewers were instructed to evaluate each submission solely on its academic merit using the following criteria:

1. Relevance of the research to the scope and themes of the conference.
2. Originality, novelty, and significance of the proposed contribution.
3. Technical soundness of the methodology, experiments, analysis, and conclusions.
4. Adequacy of experimental validation and reproducibility of results.
5. Practical applicability and potential impact of the proposed research.
6. Quality and completeness of literature review and appropriate citation of related work.
7. Compliance with ethical standards and responsible research practices.
8. Clarity, organization, and quality of presentation, including figures, tables, and language.

All submitted manuscripts underwent similarity detection using **iThenticate**, integrated with the **Springer Nature Meteor Submission System**, to identify potential textual overlap. Cases requiring further examination were reviewed by the Editorial Committee in accordance with the publisher's ethical guidelines before a final editorial decision was made.

To further strengthen the integrity and quality of the conference proceedings, the Editorial Committee implemented several additional quality assurance measures:

- Reviewer assignments were based on subject expertise and conflict-of-interest considerations.
- Editorial decisions were made independently and solely on the basis of reviewers' recommendations and scientific merit.
- Borderline submissions were discussed by the Editorial Committee before reaching a final decision.
- Final accepted manuscripts were subjected to editorial verification for formatting, references, figures, tables, and language quality to ensure compliance with the publisher's submission guidelines.
- All accepted papers were required to incorporate reviewers' comments before being forwarded for publication.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	136
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	91
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	66
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	48.5%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	76

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest that could have influenced the editorial decisions. Where any potential conflict of interest was identified, the concerned editor or reviewer was excluded from the evaluation of the respective manuscript, and the submission was reassigned to an independent editor or reviewer. All editorial decisions were made impartially and solely on the basis of the scientific quality and scholarly merit of the submitted work.

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.

