Editorial

Statement of Peer Review

Houshang Alamdari [1,2] **, Nicolas Boissonnade** [1,3,*] **and Mario Fafard** [1,3,4]

1   Aluminium Research Centre—REGAL, Québec, QC G1V 0A6, Canada;
    houshang.alamdari@gmn.ulaval.ca (H.A.); mario.fafard@aluquebec.com (M.F.)
2   Department of Mining, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, Laval University,
    Québec, QC G1V 0A6, Canada
3   Department of Civil and Water Engineering, Laval University, Québec, QC G1V 0A6, Canada
4   AluQuebec, Montréal, QC H3A 1K2, Canada
*   Correspondence: nicolas.boissonnade@gci.ulaval.ca

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: Fourwaves.com
- Number of abstracts submitted for the conference: 74
- Number of abstracts accepted for the conference: 72
- Number of paper submissions sent for review: 52
- Number of papers accepted: 48
- Acceptance rate (number of submissions accepted/number of submissions received): 90% for the articles and 64% related to abstract submission
- Average number of reviews per paper: 1
- Total number of reviewers involved: 47
- Description of the process of peer review and/or editorial oversight of all accepted content: Seventy-four abstracts have been evaluated by the members of the scientific committee. Of this number, fifty-two papers were submitted in the paper process review. All reviewers were required to complete a form to assess the content and quality of the manuscript. Regarding the content, five criteria were retained for the evaluation: "Originality/Novelty"; "Significance of Content"; "Scientific Soundness"; "Interest to the readers"; "Overall Merit". The possible answers to these five criteria were: "High"; "Average"; "Low" or "No Answer". For the quality of the manuscript, the criteria were: "Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?"; "Are all the cited references relevant to the research?"; "Is the research design appropriate?"; "Are the methods adequately described?"; "Are the results clearly presented?"; "Are the conclusions supported by the results?"; "Is the paper format respected?". For these questions, the possible answers were: "Yes/No"; "Can be improved"; "Must be improved"; "Not applicable". Afterward, the reviewer had to evaluate the English Language (from English is very difficult to understand/incomprehensible to English language and style are fine/minor spell check required). The reviewer had to make a decision from "Accept in present form" to "Reject". The reviewer then had to answer four questions: "Do you have any potential conflict of interest with regard to this paper?"; "Did you detect plagiarism?"; "Did you detect inappropriate self-citations by authors?"; "Do you have any other ethical concerns about this study?". Finally, the reviewer had to

write their comments and suggestions for the authors. The final decision was made by one of the Academic Editors.