

MDPI

Editorial

Statement of Peer Review †

K. Babu *, Anirudh Venkatraman Krishnan, K. Jayakumar and M. Dhananchezian 💿

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Sri Sivasubramaniya Nadar College of Engineering, Rajiv Gandhi Salai, OMR, Kalavakkam, Chennai 603110, India; anirudhvk@ssn.edu.in (A.V.K.); kjayakumar@ssn.edu.in (K.J.); dhananchezianm@ssn.edu.in (M.D.)

- * Correspondence: babuk@ssn.edu.in
- [†] Presented at International Conference on Processing and Performance of Materials, Chennai, India, 2–3 March 2023.

In submitting conference proceedings to *Engineering Proceedings*, the volume editors of the proceedings certify to the publisher that all papers published in this volume have been subjected to peer review administered by the volume editors. Reviews were conducted by expert referees to the professional and scientific standards expected of a proceedings journal.

- Type of peer review: single-blind.
- Conference submission management system: Through Email and Google Forms.
- Total number of abstracts received: 252.
- Total number of abstracts shortlisted: 205.
- Number of submissions assigned to Engineering Proceedings: 111.
- Number of submissions sent for review: 62.
- Number of submissions accepted: 48.
- Acceptance rate (number of submissions accepted/number of submissions received): 77%
- Average number of reviews per paper: 2 (First Review) + 1 (Second Review)
- Total number of reviewers involved: 22.
- Peer review criteria and process: Figure 1.





Citation: Babu, K.; Krishnan, A.V.; Jayakumar, K.; Dhananchezian, M. Statement of Peer Review. *Eng. Proc.* **2024**, *61*, 50. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/engproc2024061050

Published: 5 March 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

- Initial Scrutiny of abstracts by Conveners and Technical Committee.
- Accepted
 Abstracts allowed
 to present at
 conference.
- Conference chairs evaluate each presentation for best presentation award.
- Plagiarism check carried out using software.
- Expected Plagiarism value is less than 20% without references and organizational information.
- If plagiarism value is more than 20%, authors are advised to bring it down.
- Two reviewers are assigned to each
- paper.
 Single blind review done.
- Review comments are collated and communicated to the authors for revision.
- If both reviewers reject, the paper is rejected.
- Minimum one reviewer is assigned to assess whether authors have addressed all comments.
- If found satisfactory, paper is forwarded to the editor for final communication.
- Reviewer comments are evaluated prior to accepting the work for publication in the conference proceedings.

Figure 1. Peer review criteria and process.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.