A decade ago, the *Journal’s* senior editorial team described the challenges conflicts of interest places on reviewers, editors, and readers in assessing the scientific and intellectual integrity of articles submitted to and published in the *Journal*.1 Consistent with other biomedical journals and the guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, our editors noted that disclosure of conflicts of interests was the cornerstone to assessing the presence of bias: “*Potential conflicts of interest to be declared at the time of submission or review include ownership of stock or other financial investments in products or services related to the field of child and adolescent psychiatry, paid consultancy to or employment with a company whose products or services are related to the field of child and adolescent psychiatry, and honoraria or compensation, speaker fees, educational grants, expert testimony, or travel assistance involving such companies*.”1(p. 120) Additional policies noted included a requirement that the Editor-in-Chief remain free of ties to industry and that ad hoc editors from outside the senior editorial team be responsible for managing the reviews of papers in which senior editors were authors. Martin et al. noted that these policies, the conversations around them, and conflict of interest more broadly would continue to evolve.1 A decade later we feel it is fitting to revisit this evolution.

The evidence of how conflicts of interest can influence how we write about research, how we review it, how we read it, and how it influences our behavior as scientists and practitioners is even more robust than it was a decade ago. Since 2008 the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors “*Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals*,” which specifically addresses conflicts of interest, has been revised five times.2 In 2017 JAMA devoted an entire issue to conflicts of interest in medicine – 11 of the included articles were addressed issues relevant to medical journals.3 The Eight International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication, held in September 2017, had 2 plenaries focused on disclosures and conflict of interest.4

Financial conflicts of interest are perhaps the best studied. Research demonstrates that financial conflicts of interest are related to biases in study design, analysis, and reporting and interpretation of research. For example, a recent Cochrane systematic review concluded that industry sponsored-research reported more favorable results than non-industry trials and were more to include conclusions in the abstract or discussion section that were inconsistent with the empirical results.5

As our editors noted in 2008, while we most often focus on financial conflicts of interest, non-financial conflicts of interest also carry the risk of creating bias in our science. Friendships, collaborations, rivalries, research that confirms – or threatens – our own theories and worldviews can influence our reading, writing, reviewing, and editorial decisions.6

While we have a deeper understanding the impacts of conflicts of interest on science than we did a decade ago, how we address such conflicts remains largely unchanged. The first requirement is for transparency. As stated by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, “*All participants in the peer-review and publication process—not only authors but also peer reviewers, editors, and editorial board members of journals—must consider their conflicts of interest when fulfilling their roles in the process of article review and publication and must disclose all relationships that could be viewed as potential conflicts of interest*.”6 The second requirement is one of self-reflection, and when necessary, recusals. Because many nonfinancial conflicts are apparent only to ourselves, it is incumbent upon each of us individually to reflect upon our own conflicts and their potential to bias our judgement.7 Third, we must commit ourselves to a rigorous adherence to the scientific method itself, which as noted elsewhere in this issue, is inherently focused on maximizing objectivity and minimizing bias.8[ref]

Our current conflict of interest policies, which are available online for authors, reviewers, and editors at [www.jaacap.com](http://www.jaacap.com), are summarized in Table 1. These policies focus on transparency and self-reflection, disclosure, and appropriate recusals. The broader structures of the *Journal* focus on adherence to sound research methods and reporting (which will be the subject of upcoming editorials). We will continue to monitor the literature on conflict of interest and make adjustments to our policies as needed. Any changes to these policies will be reported in the *Journal*.

Finally, it is important to note that while conflicts of interest may create bias, we should not assume that when such conflicts exist bias is automatically present.9 Given this, we believe the Journal’s requirement for transparency must be accompanied by the commitment of readers, authors, reviewers, and editors to thoughtful and honest self-reflection about our individual and collective conflicts of interest and our vigilance around how these can shape our thinking.
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| --- |
| **Table 1. Summary of Key Journal Policies Around Conflicts of Interest** |
| For Authors | * Authors must identify the source of financial support for the conduct of the research.
* Authors must disclose any and all financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could influence or be perceived to influence their work. Authors should err on the side of disclosure when in doubt.
* Funding and disclosures will be published with accepted manuscripts.
 |
| For Reviewers  | * When invited to review, contact the Editorial Office immediately if you have a personal, professional, or financial conflict of interest with the respect to the content of the manuscript or with the author(s).
* When submitting your review, you will be asked to report any and all conflicts, financial or otherwise, whether or not directly related to the subject of the paper. This information will be shared with the editors alongside your completed reviews.
 |
| For Editors | * Potential editors must identify any and all financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could influence or be perceived to influence their work. These disclosures are required when appointed, when they develop new relationships, and annually. Editor disclosures are published annually in the December issue of the Journal.
* An Ad Hoc Editor will be appointed to manage the reviews of papers authored by senior Editors (Editor-in-Chief, Associate Editor, Deputy Editors, and Assistant Editors). Ad hoc editorship will be published with accepted manuscripts.
* Editors will be particularly mindful of the potential for biases in Editorials as they do not undergo peer review.
* The Editor-in-Chief is, and will remain, free of any financial relationships with the biomedical industry.
 |