Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology (*CGH*) publishes clinical articles on all aspects of the digestive system, including the liver and pancreas. The types of articles *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* publishes include original papers, review articles, brief communications, and special category manuscripts. Manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with the "Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals" developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (http://www.icmje.org). *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (http://www.publicationethics.org.uk).

Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology has a total circulation of approximately 19,000—about 16,000 in the United States and 3000 in other countries; 70% of subscribers are AGA members.

Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology is indexed in Current Contents, Excerpta Medica, MEDLINE®, Science Citation Index, and Scopus.

Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology strongly encourages the submission of papers on a breadth of clinical topics in gastroenterology and hepatology, especially randomized controlled trials, high-quality observational including epidemiological and outcomes studies, and novel case series. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* is interested in several aspects of clinical and translational studies including treatment, prevention, screening, and diagnosis. High-quality systematic and meta-analyses are also welcome and will be highlighted in a special section. Publication priority will be determined by factors such as novelty, impact upon clinical practice, strength of the experimental design, and mechanistic insight.

ETHICAL STANDARDS

Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology strongly discourages the submission of more than one article dealing with related aspects of the same study. In almost all cases, a single study is best reported in a single paper.

The Journal editors consider research/publication misconduct to be a serious breach of ethics and will take action as necessary to address such misconduct, which includes submission or publication of information that:

- Is intentionally erroneous,
- Has been published elsewhere by a different author without acknowledgment (plagiarism),
- Has been published elsewhere by the same author without acknowledgment (duplicate publication), or
- Is subsequently published elsewhere by the same author without acknowledgment, attribution, or permission from the AGA Institute, as holder of the copyright, to reprint or adapt the material.

Each author who submits a manuscript to *CGH* must attest to several author statements in the manuscript management system, thereby assigning copyright of the manuscript to the AGA Institute and affirming authorship responsibility, manuscript originality, payment of color reproduction fees, IRB/Animal Care Committee approval, role of study sponsor, financial disclosures, and funding sources.

Breaches of *CGH*'s ethical standards may result in proscribed submission for all authors of the concerned manuscript and, when appropriate, notification of the authors' institutions. All authors are fully responsible for the content of the manuscript.

The publication of abstracts is not considered duplicate publication but should be disclosed in the cover letter accompanying the manuscript submission.

Authorship

Each author must have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for the content of the paper and must approve of the final version of the manuscript. Authorship should be based on substantive contributions to each of the following:

- Conception and design of the study;
- Generation, collection, assembly, analysis and/or interpretation of data;
- Drafting or revision of the manuscript;
- Approval of the final version of the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

A. Potential Conflicts of Interest

The following are examples of conflicts of interest (COI) that may occur with editors, authors (including invited authors), and reviewers. Interactions considered pertinent are from the start of the research activity in a specific program until such time that a submission is anticipated to be published or one year from submission date, whichever is longer.

a. Editors: Editors who make final decisions about manuscripts must have no personal, professional, or financial involvement in any of the issues they might judge. Examples of personal involvement with an author include former student, fellow, mentor, or relative. Examples of professional involvement include academic rivalry, being from the same institution or research group as the author, evaluating a manuscript submitted by a member of the board of editors, or collaborating (eg, co-authoring research article or grant) with an author. Examples of financial involvement include employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants/patents received, and royalties with an entity (or competing entity) discussed in the manuscript.
It is a COI for editors of the AGA Institute journals to hold a position of editorial responsibility for a competing publication. The Ethics Committee reviews disclosure statements submitted by editors and notifies either/both the Secretary/Treasurer and editor of any potential

conflicts. The procedures contained in Section C of the "AGA/AGA Institute Policy on Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest" apply if a conflict is found to exist.

b. *Authors*: COI for an author may arise if there exists a financial arrangement (eg, employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants/patents received, and royalties) with a company whose product figures prominently in the submitted manuscript or with a company that makes a competing product.

c. *Reviewers*: COI for reviewers exist when they have had an ongoing collaboration, original publications, or grants with the authors within the previous two years, except when part of a multicenter group from a different site; are from the same institution as the authors; or have any financial arrangements (eg, employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants/patents received, and royalties) with a company whose product figures prominently in the submitted manuscript or with a company that makes a competing product.

B. Process

Potential COI are to be disclosed at the beginning of the peer-review process.

a. *Editors*: An associate editor having COI with a submitted manuscript must recuse himself from handling the manuscript and request that the manuscript be reassigned. The editor-in-chief having COI with a submitted manuscript must assign review to one of an associate or guest editor for handling. A manuscript submitted by one of the members of the board of editors must be assigned to a guest editor.

b. *Authors*: The senior or corresponding author assumes full responsibility for supplying the following information on the title page at manuscript submission:

   i. For each author, disclosure of any financial arrangement with any company whose product figures prominently in the submitted manuscript or that makes a competing product; or a statement for each author that there is no conflict to disclose.

   ii. A disclosure of all funding sources supporting the work and all institutional or corporate affiliations.

   iii. A list of individuals who provided writing assistance for the manuscript and the source of funds that supported this assistance.

In addition, at manuscript submission, each author must attest to several author statements in the manuscript management system, thereby assigning copyright of the manuscript to the AGA Institute and affirming authorship responsibility, manuscript originality, payment of color reproduction fees, IRB/Animal Care Committee approval, role of study sponsor, financial disclosures, and funding sources.

Based on the information provided, the editors will determine whether COI exists and decide to either a) reject the manuscript or b) publish the manuscript with the COI disclosed.

c. *Reviewers*: When invited, reviewers must decline to review a manuscript if a potential COI exists. After review, all reviewers must agree to and initial one of the following statements, which appear in the journals' manuscript tracking system:

   i. I, the undersigned Reviewer, certify that I have not had an ongoing collaboration, original publication, or grant with the authors within the previous two years, except in the case of being a part of a multicenter group from a different site, nor am I from the same institution as the authors. I also certify that I do not have any financial arrangements (e.g., employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants/patents received, and royalties) with a company whose product figures prominently in the submitted manuscript or with a company that makes a competing product.

   ii. I have listed any potential conflicts on interest in the Comments to Editors field.

If the reviewer discloses a potential COI after the review, the handling associate editor decides if the review should still be used to judge the manuscript.

C. Sanctions

Should an editor, author, or reviewer fail to disclose a potential COI and this is discovered after publication, the following sanctions may be applied according to the severity of the infraction.

a. *Editors*:

   i. A letter of reprimand and warning as to future conduct from the editor, in the case of an associate editor, or from the Chair of the Publications Committee, in the case of the editor.

   ii. Dismissal from the position.

b. *Authors*:

   i. A letter from the editor of explanation and education where there appears to be a genuine misunderstanding of principles.

   ii. A letter from the editor of reprimand and warning as to future conduct.

   iii. A letter from the editor to the author's institution or funding body.

   iv. Publication of a notice detailing the author's failure to disclose the COI.

   v. Publication of an editorial detailing the full details of the misconduct.

   vi. Refusal to accept future submissions from the author on a sliding scale of one-to-five years.

   vii. Formal retraction or withdrawal of the paper from the scientific literature.

   viii. Reporting the case to the Office of Research Integrity (ORI).

c. *Reviewers*:

   i. A letter from the editor of explanation and education where there appears to be a genuine misunderstanding of principles.

   ii. A letter from the editor of reprimand and warning as to future conduct.

   iii. A letter from the editor to the reviewer's institution.

   iv. Refusal to allow the individual to review for the journal on a sliding scale of one-to-five years.

This policy was developed in accordance with the guidelines set forth by COPE and ICMJE.