

Conflicts of interest

Pelviperrineology agrees with the Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research of International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) regarding the Conflicts of Interest. The Journal insists on full disclosure of competing financial and other interests from all authors. This is mandatory and a condition of publication.

Definition: Conflict of interest exists when an author (or the author's institution), reviewer, or editor has financial or personal relationships that inappropriately influence (bias) his or her actions (such relationships are also known as dual commitments, competing interests, or competing loyalties). These relationships vary from being negligible to having great potential for influencing judgment. Not all relationships represent true conflict of interest. On the other hand, the potential for conflict of interest can exist regardless of whether an individual believes that the relationship affects his or her scientific judgment. Financial relationships (such as employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, and paid expert testimony) are the most easily identifiable conflicts of interest and the most likely to undermine the credibility of the journal, the authors, and of science itself. However, conflicts can occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic competition, and intellectual passion. All participants in the peer-review and publication process must disclose all relationships that could be viewed as potential conflicts of interest. Disclosure of such relationships is also important in connection with editorials and review articles, because it can be more difficult to detect bias in these types of publications than in reports of original research. Editors may use information disclosed in conflict-of-interest and financial-interest statements as a basis for editorial decisions.

Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Individual Authors' Commitments

When authors submit a manuscript they are responsible for disclosing all financial and personal relationships that might bias their work. To prevent ambiguity, authors must state explicitly whether potential conflicts do or do not exist.

Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Project Support

Increasingly, individual studies receive funding from commercial firms, private foundations, and government. The conditions of this funding have the potential to bias and otherwise discredit the research. Researchers should not enter into agreements that interfere with their access to all of the data and their ability to analyze them independently, and to prepare and publish manuscripts. Authors should describe the role of the study sponsor, if any, in study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication. If the supporting source had no such involvement, the authors should so state. Biases potentially introduced when sponsors are directly involved in research are analogous to methodological biases.

Potential Conflicts of Interest Related to Commitments of Editors, Journal Staff, or Reviewers

- Pelviperrineology avoids selecting external peer reviewers with obvious potential conflicts of interest--for example, those who work in the same department or institution as any of the authors.

-
- Pelviperineology's Reviewers must disclose to editors any conflicts of interest that could bias their opinions of the manuscript, and they should recuse themselves from reviewing specific manuscripts if the potential for bias exists. Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests.
 - Pelviperinology's editors who make final decisions about manuscripts must have no personal, professional, or financial involvement in any of the issues they might judge. Other members of the editorial staff, if they participate in editorial decisions, must provide editors with a current description of their financial interests (as they might relate to editorial judgments) and recuse themselves from any decisions in which a conflict of interest exists. Editorial staff must not use information gained through working with manuscripts for private gain.

Informed consent

A signed statement of informed consent to publish (in print and online) patient descriptions, photographs, videos, and pedigrees should be obtained from all persons (parents or legal guardians for minors) who can be identified in such written descriptions, photographs, or pedigrees and should be indicated in the Acknowledgment section of the manuscript. Such persons should be shown the manuscript before its submission.

Definition: Patients have a right to privacy that should not be infringed without informed consent. Identifying information, including patients' names, initials, or hospital numbers, should not be published in written descriptions, photographs, and pedigrees unless the information is essential for scientific purposes and the patient (or parent or guardian) gives written informed consent for publication.

Informed consent for this purpose requires that a patient who is identifiable be shown the manuscript to be published. Identifying details should be omitted if they are not essential. Complete anonymity is difficult to achieve, however, and informed consent should be obtained if there is any doubt. For example, masking the eye region in photographs of patients is inadequate protection of anonymity. If identifying characteristics are altered to protect anonymity, such as in genetic pedigrees, authors should provide assurance that alterations do not distort scientific meaning and editors should so note.

Protection of Human and Animals rights

Pelviperineology agrees with the Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research of International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) regard protection of Human Subjects and Animals rights.

Definition: When reporting experiments on human subjects, Authors should indicate whether the procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional and national) and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

If doubt exists whether the research was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration, the authors must explain the rationale for their approach and demonstrate that the institutional review body explicitly approved the doubtful aspects of the study. When reporting experiments on animals, authors should indicate whether the institutional and national guide for the care and use of laboratory animals was followed.