

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

ICAMS conference submissions are subject to a double-blind peer review process by at least two reviewers who are renowned scientists and considered experts in the subject the paper concerns. Reviewers contribute to editorial decisions by helping the Scientific Committee select which papers to accept and reject, while also helping the authors improve their papers and presentations.

Reviewing Process

The submitted papers are initially evaluated by the Editor-in-chief and checked in terms of similarity using antiplagiarism software. Each paper is then assigned to at least two available reviewers with expertise in the subject of the paper. Each reviewer will receive a number of 3 to 7 papers to evaluate, according to the option they indicate in the Review Invitation they have received from the managing editor.

The deadline for turning in the reviews is approximately one month. The review process is based on an evaluation form which assesses the scientific and technical standard of the papers submitted. The paper will be accepted for publication provided reviews are favourable. In case of diversified opinions of the reviewers, the Scientific Committee will make the final decision. The authors will be notified as soon as possible on the result of paper evaluation (Excellent, Acceptable – requires revision, Rejection).

Best Practices

Promptness

Any selected reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a paper or knows that its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse themselves from the review process.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.

Standards of Objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of Sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and Conflict of Interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the papers.

Reviewer Misconduct

ICAMS Editors will take reviewer misconduct seriously and pursue any allegation of breach of confidentiality, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Allegations of serious reviewer misconduct, such as plagiarism, will be taken to the institutional level.

Reviewing Criteria

The reviewer is asked to use a scale of 1 to 4 (1 – Poor, 2 – Average, 3 – Good, 4 – Very good) to assess the paper(s) they receive for review in terms of the following criteria:

- Originality of the research
- The relevance of the research domain
- Presentation format (clarity of the objectives/results/assessment)
- Content (research methodology, scientific level, application)

The reviewer is strongly encouraged to give written feedback to the authors to help them improve their paper.

Finally, the reviewer is asked to provide a general conclusion following evaluation: Excellent, Acceptable (requires revision), or Rejection.