



Peer-Review Statements

Gonçalo Canto Moniz^{1,*}, Beatrice Bechet², José Miguel Lameiras³, Marco Aciri⁴, Isabel Ferreira⁵, Nathalie Nunes⁶, Milena Tasheva-Petrova⁷, Ingrid Andersson⁸, Beatriz Caitana⁹, Guido Ferilli¹⁰

¹ Centre for Social Studies, Department of Architecture & University of Coimbra, Portugal

² Université Gustave Eiffel, France

³ BIOPOLIS, & University of Porto, Portugal

⁴ University of Nova Gorica, Slovenia

⁵ Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Portugal

⁶ Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Portugal

⁷ University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy, Bulgaria

⁸ IKED - International Organisation for Knowledge Economy and Enterprise Development, Sweden

⁹ Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Portugal

¹⁰ IULM University, Italy

*Editor-in-Chief of the NATiURB Conference. Email: gmoniz@ces.uc.pt

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the *NATiURB Nature for an Inclusive and Innovative Urban Regeneration* during 16 and 17 June 2022 in Milan, Italy. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the *Scientific 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 2 reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Oxford abstracts for the Conference and EquinOCS for the Proceedings.

At the Conference stage, submission of abstracts were first screened for generic quality and suitability by the editors. 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 at least from one reviewer and the two

© The Author(s) 2024

G. Canto Moniz et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Nature for an Inclusive and Innovative Urban Regeneration (NATiURB 2022)*, Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 24, https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-469-3_1

editors. 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.

At the Proceedings stage, the submissions of full paper 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 at least from one reviewer and the two editors. 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, after checking if the comments were integrated.

In both stages, reviewers had the opportunity to recused from the handling of papers by closely related authors.

Two papers were rejected due to similarities with published material.

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.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Proceedings</i>	
<i>Total submissions</i>	34
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	34
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	29
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	85%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	59
<i>Papers withdrawn by authors during the review process</i>	3

<i>Conference</i>	
<i>Total submissions of abstracts</i>	103
<i>Number of abstracts sent for peer review</i>	94
<i>Number of abstracts by invitation</i>	9
<i>Number of accepted abstracts for presentation</i>	100
<i>Number of abstracts accepted as posters</i>	3
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	100%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	37

4. COMPETING INTERESTS

Neither the Editor-in-Chief nor any member of the Scientific Committee declares any competing interest. As a rule, the editors were invited to submit papers to other themes that were not coordinated by them and that they didn't had access to the evaluator name. Nevertheless two exceptions took place:

- a) The editor-in-chief submitted a paper to a session that he doesn't coordinate, nevertheless, he had the permissions to follow the review process.
- b) The editor José Miguel Lameiras submitted a paper with other authors to his session, although all the review process was coordinated by the other editor.

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.

