



Statement of Peer Review

Claudia M. Haros ^{1,*} , Loreto A. Muñoz ² and María Dolores Ortolá ³

¹ Cereal Group, Instituto de Agroquímica y Tecnología de Alimentos, Spanish Council for Scientific Research (IATA-CSIC), 46980 Valencia, Spain

² Instituto de Investigación y Postgrado, Facultad de Medicina y Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Central de Chile, Santiago 8370292, Chile; loreto.munoz@ucentral.cl

³ Instituto Universitario de Ingeniería de Alimentos-FoodUPV, Universitat Politècnica de València, 46022 Valencia, Spain; mdortola@tal.upv.es

* Correspondence: cmharos@iata.csic.es; Tel.: +34-963900022

In submitting conference proceedings to the *Biology and Life Sciences Forum*, 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 according to the professional and scientific standards expected of a proceedings journal.

- Type of peer review: single-blind; double-blind; triple-blind; open; other (please describe): single-blind.
- Conference submission management system: The conference was organized through the web: <https://congreso.adeituv.es/valse23/?lang=en>.
- Number of submissions sent for review: all of them (17).
- Number of submissions accepted: all of them (17).
- Acceptance rate (number of submissions accepted/number of submissions received): all accepted (17/17).
- Average number of reviews per paper: two or three.
- Total number of reviewers involved: three.
- Any additional information on the review process:

Reviewers' Criteria: The editors were the reviewers who were provided with guidelines and criteria by the conference organizers. These criteria include assessing the significance of the research, the rigor of the methodology, the clarity of the presentation, the originality of the work, and its relevance to the field. Reviewers also comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript and may suggest improvements or revisions.

Editorial Decision: Based on the feedback from peer reviewers, the editors make a decision. The possible decisions include:

- Acceptance: The manuscript is accepted for publication without major revisions.
- Minor Revisions: The manuscript needs minor changes or clarifications before acceptance.
- Major Revisions: The manuscript requires substantial revisions and needs to be reevaluated after revisions.
- Rejection: The manuscript does not meet the necessary quality and is not suitable for publication in its current form.

Revisions and Resubmission: If revisions are requested, the authors make the necessary changes to address the editors' comments and concerns. The revised manuscript is then resubmitted to the editors for further evaluation.



Citation: Haros, C.M.; Muñoz, L.A.; Ortolá, M.D. Statement of Peer Review. *Biol. Life Sci. Forum* **2023**, *25*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/blsf2023025014>

Published: 28 September 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Final Decision: The editorial or handling editor makes a final decision based on the revised manuscript and feedback from the authors. This decision may lead to acceptance, further revisions, or rejection.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.