

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Peer Review Declaration

To cite this article: 2023 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **1176** 011002

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- [Peer review declaration](#)

- [Peer review declaration](#)

- [Peer review declaration](#)



The Electrochemical Society
Advancing solid state & electrochemical science & technology

243rd Meeting with SOFC-XVIII

Boston, MA • May 28 – June 2, 2023

Accelerate scientific discovery!

Learn More & Register



Peer Review Declaration

The Organiser and/or the Editor(s) in an **IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science proceeding** are required to declare details about their peer review processes:

<https://publishingsupport.iopscience.iop.org/questions/proceedings-peer-review-policy/>

As part of this, the **IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science** ask the Organiser and/or the Editor(s) to provide details about our process:

Type of peer review: Double-blind, *author and reviewer identities have been hidden to each other*

Criteria used by Reviewers when accepting/declining papers. Was there the opportunity to resubmit articles after revisions?

All accepted papers in this proceeding have been through a minimum of two rounds of reviews, which provided opportunities to resubmit revised contributions. Both abstract and the first draft of the full article were sent out to two separate reviewers for reviewing them. The process was double-blind, author and reviewer identities have been hidden to each other. After the full paper was reviewed, authors who received Minor Changes or Major Changes decisions were asked to respond to the reviewers' comments by highlighting any changes made in their papers, and by providing a detailed response letter back to the editors, in which they were asked to outline the changes they made, and to describe how these changes addressed the comments provided to them by the reviewers. The Chair of the conference and the Head of the international scientific committee reviewed all the improvements and changes made in each paper that was re-submitted. Authors who did not appropriately address all reviewer comments and requests were asked to respond to the comments, and to resubmit their papers, once again. In addition to the above, a separate person was hired by the Chair of the conference to review the formatting of each accepted paper, and any paper that did not meet the formatting and the style requirements was sent back to its authors for making the necessary formatting corrections.

Conference submission management system: Event air

Number of submissions received: 74

Number of submissions sent for review: 73

Number of submissions accepted: 46

Acceptance Rate (Number of Submissions Accepted / Number of Submissions Received X 100):
62,2 % acceptance rate (46 / 74 x 100)

Average number of reviews per paper: 2

Total number of reviewers involved: 39

Any additional info on review process (eg Plagiarism check system):

No plagiarism system used by the editors

The Publisher used plagiarism check system

Contact person for queries (Full name, affiliation, institutional email address)

Nora Johanne Klungseth, Associate professor,
Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)
Faculty of Engineering
Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
nora.klungseth@ntnu.no

