By submitting a paper to ATCIDS 2026, the authors agree to the review process and understand that papers undergo a peer-review process. Manuscripts will be reviewed by appropriately qualified experts in the field selected by the conference committee, who will give detailed comments, and if the submission gets acceptance, the authors submit a revised version that takes into account this feedback. All papers are reviewed using a double-blind review process. The Committees of ATCIDS 2026 invest great efforts in reviewing the papers submitted to the conference and organizing the sessions to enable the participants to gain maximum benefit.

Peer review process overview

i) Manuscript Allocation: Within one week after submission, the Editor-in-Chief assigns each manuscript to 2–3 independent reviewers with expertise aligned to the paper's topic. Reviewers must declare no conflicts of interest (e.g., collaborations, institutional affiliations, or financial ties with authors) prior to participation.

ii) Initial Screening: Reviewers conduct a preliminary check for compliance with formatting guidelines, structural completeness (abstract, methods, results, etc.), and thematic relevance. Manuscripts failing to meet basic standards are desk-rejected, with detailed feedback provided to authors.

iii) **In-Depth Evaluation:** Reviewers assess the manuscript's originality, methodological validity, data integrity, and contribution to the field. Evaluations include:

- A categorical rating (Accept/Minor Revision/Major Revision/Reject)
- Constructive comments for improvement
- A confidential recommendation to the Editor

iv) Decision-Making & Conflict Resolution: The Editor consolidates reviews and resolves discrepancies through panel discussions. Final decisions prioritize both scholarly rigor and a target acceptance rate of 40%, which balances selectivity with support for emerging research. Borderline manuscripts may undergo additional review or statistical validation.

v) Author Notification: Authors receive a decision within 1-week post-review, including anonymized reviewer comments. Accepted manuscripts proceed to production; others may be invited to resubmit after revision.

vi) Revisions & Appeals: Revised manuscripts are re-evaluated within 2 weeks. Authors may appeal decisions with a point-by-point rebuttal, which triggers an independent audit by the Editorial Board.

Reviewer's criteria

1. Originality and Innovation: Is the paper presenting new ideas, methodologies, or findings? Does it contribute to the advancement of the field?
2. Technical Soundness: Are the methods used sound and appropriate? Is the analysis rigorous? Are the results well-supported by the data?
3. Relevance to the Conference: Does the paper fit within the scope of the conference themes and tracks?
4. Clarity and Organization: Is the paper well-organized, with clear arguments and structure? Are the ideas presented in a coherent and understandable way?
5. Literature Review and References: Does the paper appropriately engage with existing literature? Is there a clear understanding of

the state of the field?

6. Ethical Considerations: Does the research adhere to ethical standards, especially in areas like data privacy, human subjects, etc.?

7. Practical Implications: For applied research, reviewers will also assess the potential practical impact or applications of the findings.

8. Each of these criteria is typically scored on a numerical scale (e.g., 1-5), and reviewers are asked to provide detailed feedback and suggestions for improvement.

Ethics & Transparency

COPE Compliance: All participants follow the COPE Ethical Guidelines.

Gender/Geographic Inclusion: Reviewers evaluate whether gender, race, or geographic factors are appropriately addressed.

Diversity Auditors: 2 committee members monitor demographic balance in accepted papers quarterly.

AI Usage: AI tools (e.g., plagiarism detection, statistical error flags) assist but never replace human judgment.