Editorial

Statement of Peer Review †

Viola Galligioni 1,*, Marino Campagnol 2, Sara Fuochi 3,*, Valeria Pagano 4, Marcello Raspa 5, Silvia Sabbioni 6 and Paola Zarattini 7,*

1 Netherlands Institute for Neuroscience, 1105 BA Amsterdam, The Netherlands; v.galligioni@nin.knaw.nl
2 Dipartimento di Scienze Biomediche, Chirurgiche ed Odontoiatriche, University of Milan, 20133 Milan, Italy; marino.campagnol@gmail.com
3 Experimental Animal Center, University of Bern, CH-3008 Bern, Switzerland
4 Fondazione RiMED, 90133 Palermo, Italy; vpagano@fondazionerimed.com
5 Institute of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, National Research Council, 0015 Rome, Italy; marcello.raspa@cnr.it
6 Dipartimento di Scienze della Vita e Biotecnologie, University of Ferrara, 44121 Ferrara, Italy; sbs@unife.it
7 Department of Life Sciences, University of Trieste, 34128 Trieste, Italy
* Correspondence: sara.fuochi@unibe.ch (S.F.); pzarattini@units.it (P.Z.); Tel.: +39-040-558-8881 (P.Z.)
† Presented at XXVIII AISAL Annual Meeting, Trieste, Italy, 29–30 September 2022.

In submitting conference proceedings to Biology and Life Sciences Forum, the volume editors of the proceedings certify to the publisher that all abstracts published in this report 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: open
- Conference submission management system: via email to the Association Secretariat
- Number of submissions sent for review: 14 for Poster session
- Number of submissions accepted: 13 for Poster session
- Acceptance rate (number of submissions accepted/number of submissions received): 92.8%
- Average number of reviews per paper: 2
- Total number of reviewers involved: 2 Primary reviewers for Poster Abstracts; the whole AISAL Board (7 members including the 2 primary reviewers) for plenum review and discussion when primary reviewers raised concerns on acceptance or rejection of Poster Abstracts

peer-review process and regulations:

- For Poster Abstracts, 2 Primary Reviewers selected from the Association Board were responsible for peer review; All board members were included in a second plenary review and discussion when the primary reviewers raised concerns on acceptance or rejection of Poster Abstracts.
- For Oral presentations, speakers were all invited by the AISAL Board and Congress Scientific Committee; Presentations topics were approved by AISAL Board and Congress Scientific Committee. Abstracts were revised and approved by AISAL Board upon preparation of the Conference report.
- For Roundtable Summary, all involved participants contributed to the drafting of the summary; the final version of the summary was revised and approved by the AISAL Board upon preparation of the Conference report.
- English Language Review by V. Galligioni and S. Fuochi.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

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.