



# Peer-Review Statements

Md. Rokonzaman<sup>1\*</sup>, Md. Shahjahan Ali<sup>1</sup>, Zahid Hossain<sup>2</sup>, Mahmudul Hasan Mizan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Khulna University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh

<sup>2</sup> Arkansas State University, United States

\*Editor-in-Chief of the ICCESD 2024; Email: [rokon@ce.kuet.ac.bd](mailto:rokon@ce.kuet.ac.bd)

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Civil Engineering for Sustainable Development during February 7-9, 2024 in *Khulna, Bangladesh*. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the technical 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 submitted paper is peer-reviewed (Double Blind) to judge its quality for allowing the presentation in the conference. At least two reviewers having expertise in the relevant areas for each paper based on the contents was assigned by the editors using the conference submission management system named "Conference management Toolkit". The Editors assigns not more than 8 papers to a single reviewer. Based on the evaluation and comparison with past published papers in elsewhere, the reviews judge whether the paper is to be accepted or rejected. The reviewers try to accept a paper that can contribute to the future academic/technological development, even if it has some drawbacks. When the reviewers recommend the rejection, reasons will be given according to the items mentioned in the prescribed format of Paper Review Report. The results of review are to be described and communicated to the author(s) in detail regardless of its acceptance or rejection.

The editors' judges if paper is to be accepted based on the reports by the reviewers. In principle, if at least two reviewers recommend the acceptance, the paper will be accepted. If any reviewer requires a revision on the paper, the editors may request author to revise the paper. Editors reviews the revised paper to judge whether the author has given satisfactory revision and response to the comments by reviewer. The reviewers may be requested to re-review the paper for this purpose. The editors have the responsibility in its final judgment and notifies the decision promptly to the concerned author.

### Flowchart of Peer Review process with review time plan

- ✓ Every research paper is reviewed by two reviewers (Double blind review).
- ✓ Reviewers are asked to submit the review report within three weeks from the day a reviewer received and approved the review request.
- ✓ If both reviewers give minor correction, then it is sent to the corresponding Author for modifications and asked to set back the revised manuscript withing two weeks.

© The Author(s) 2024

M. Rokonzaman et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Civil Engineering for Sustainable Development (ICCESD 2024)*, Atlantis Highlights in Engineering 34,

[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-478-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-478-5_1)

The editor checks the modified version properly whether it is done according to the reviewer's comments. If it is ok, then the paper has been accepted.

- ✓ If one of the reviewers or (both reviewers) give(s) major correction, then it is sent to the corresponding Author for modifications and asked to set back the revised manuscript within two weeks. After receiving modified version of the research paper, it is again sent to the reviewers for reviewing and request to send back the feedback within one week. If the reviewers are satisfied and give the minor corrections, then it is sent to the Author again for further modification and asked them to send back the response to the review report within one week.
- ✓ After receiving modified version of the research paper, it is sent to the member of the editors. If it is done according to the reviewer's comments, the paper is then accepted.
- ✓ If one of the reviewers give minor/major correction and another reviewer comment is rejection, then it is sent to the third reviewer for reviewing. If the third reviewer gives the major/minor correction, then it is sent to the corresponding Author for correction and modifications. If the third reviewer rejects the research article, then it is assumed that the article is not worthy for publication and is rejected. After rejection, information is sent to the corresponding Author.

## 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; scope and themes of the conference; originality and novelty, details methodology and analysis of the research; ethical standards, accuracy in language.

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. After receiving the research paper, Similarity Index and Plagiarism (SIP) checking is done by Turnitin. If the SIP is less than 30%, single source SIP is less than 5% and SIP from author's own papers is less than 10%, then the paper is sent to the reviewer.

## 3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	1018
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	680
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	25
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	3.7%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	100

#### 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.

