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- **Type of peer review:**
  All papers revise by three of committee members of the conference. The papers are divided based on the specialist of the committee members; and in the case of special topics, other reviewers invite for reviewing the selected manuscripts.
  
  Also, reviewers have considered the Technical Criteria (Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing) and Quality Criteria (Originality: the work relevant and novel, Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results. Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?)

- **Conference submission management system:**
  Our conference has Secretary for management on conference papers. So, authors send their papers to Conference E-mail, and our secretary has managed it. The secretary sends the papers to the conference chairs to evaluate the suitability of submitted papers to the conference scopes.

- **Number of submissions received:**
  Especially in this time, only few of papers were submitted cause of COVID-19. The total number of submission papers were 34 papers.

- **Number of submissions sent for review:**
  The submission papers were revised from the management conference system and committee organizations and the papers that sent for review were 25 papers.

- **Number of submissions accepted:**
  The papers that accepted in the conference for publishing after review processing are 8 papers.

- **Acceptance Rate (Number of Submissions Accepted / Number of Submissions Received X 100):** 23 %

- **Average number of reviews per paper:**
  Different cycles review processing implemented for improving the papers quality. In average, three times review on per paper were processed.

- **Total number of reviewers involved:**
Three of reviewers are took part in the review process. When we receive positive reports from two at least we can accept the paper after evaluating the reviewer report and authors responses.

- **Any additional info on review process:**
  The processing of review work of this conference was carried out as follows: (1) the secretary received the papers by emails and processed the initial checking of the papers, he revised the format, language and roughly check of papers contents; (2) the general chairs received the processed papers and they revised the papers scopes, Technical Criteria (Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy and correctness. Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts. Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing) and Quality Criteria (Originality: the work relevant and novel, Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results. Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?)
  If these papers relate to the conference scopes it can be passed to the next processing, else the papers can be rejected. (3) all accepted papers divided into categories based on the papers contents and sent to three committee members who have a good experience in the paper contents. (4) after receiving the review reports from the committee members, the review reports sent to authors for sending their responses on the listed comments. (5) the reviewing cycling process divided into accept, minor and major revisions; and based on the review comments and suggestion, the papers can be processing up to three times to improve the manuscript contents. (6) finally, the authors should revise/argue the comments and send their response through email; and the processing cycling until organizer accept the paper according to the final review reports.
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