



Peer-Review Statements

R Murugan^{1,*} Ram Kumar Karsh¹, Tripti Goel¹, Rabul Hussain Laskar¹

¹ Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering,
National Institute of Technology Silchar, Silchar, Assam, India 788010

*Editor-in-Chief of the **SIPCOV 2023**. Email: murugan.rmn@ece.nits.ac.in

All of the articles in this proceedings volume have been presented at the **SIPCOV 2023** during **30-31 March 2023** in **Silchar, Assam, India**. These articles have been peer reviewed by the members of the **Technical Program Committee (TPC)** 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 *at least 3* reviewer(s) independently.

The conference submission management system was Microsoft CMT.

[Please describe the overall process of review for your conference. Example text: The submissions were first screened for generic quality and suitability with respect to the tracks of the conference. 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 three reviewers. The acceptance of a revised manuscript was final.

Authors of a rejected submission were not given any opportunity to revise and re-submit the papers.

The papers were assigned to the reviewers based on the expertise with respect to the tracks.

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

© The Author(s) 2024

R. Murugan et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Signal Processing and Computer Vision (SIPCOV 2023)*, Advances in Engineering Research 239,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-529-4_1

1. Originality: Template: Technical content:
2. The paper is related to the scope of the conference.
3. Does the title clearly reflect the content and outcomes in the manuscript? Does the title include important keywords?
4. The research design, methods, analysis of the data, interpretation of results, and conclusion are satisfactory.
5. The organization of the paper is satisfactory
6. Overall presentation including the use of language is satisfactory.
7. Is there any novelty in the paper and same has been highlighted?
8. Specific review comments (Enter the text)
9. Your final decision of the paper

In addition, all of the articles have been checked for textual overlap in an effort to detect possible signs of plagiarism by the publisher. The manuscripts are checked by the Turnitin plagiarism software before sent for peer review to avoid plagiarism issues.

3. KEY METRICS

<i>Total submissions</i>	108
<i>Number of articles sent for peer review</i>	100
<i>Number of accepted articles</i>	36
<i>Acceptance rate</i>	33.33%
<i>Number of reviewers</i>	30

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.

