

Policy enforcement

If related content is found to be too similar to the BJGG submission, or if a duplicate submission is discovered, we will reject the manuscript.

Duplicate content discovered after publication will be addressed depending on the degree of overlap. The journal may issue a correction or a retraction as appropriate.

Manipulation of the Publication Process

Systematic manipulation of the publication process (sometimes referred to as “paper mill” activity) is defined by COPE as an individual or group of individuals using dishonest or fraudulent practices to

- prevent independent assessment or inappropriately influence peer review outcomes,
- sell or misrepresent authorship, and/or
- publish fabricated or plagiarized research.

Authors should not use any third-party services that offer article content, authorship, or positive peer review outcomes.

Also, authors should not suggest/request handling editors or reviewers with whom there may be a potential competing interest and must not interfere with the review process whether directly or via third-party services.

BJGG will reject or retract articles suspected of any manipulation of the publication process, and may inform the relevant institution(s) (e.g. an author’s or reviewer’s employer) of our concerns. In discussing these cases with authors or other parties we may choose not to disclose detailed information about our assessment and specific concerns.

Concerns About Data or Figures

When preparing figures, images should not be manipulated or adjusted in any way that could lead to misinterpretation of the information present in the original raw image data.

When concerns are raised about reported results, BJGG requests the original underlying data for the experiment(s) in question. If the original data are not available or are not provided in a timely manner, we may take editorial action on the article based on our review of the materials in hand.

In cases involving image issues or other data concerns, the original underlying data are instrumental in clarifying the issues raised and the reliability of the reported results. The unavailability of original data in such cases may impact editorial outcomes.

Artificial Intelligence Tools and Technologies

BJGG expects that articles should report the listed authors' own work and ideas. Any contributions made by other sources must be clearly and correctly attributed.

Contributions by artificial intelligence (AI) tools and technologies to a study or to an article's contents must be clearly reported in a dedicated section of the Methods, or in the Acknowledgements section for article types lacking a Methods section. This section should include the name(s) of any tools used, a description of how the authors used the tool(s) and evaluated the validity of the tool's outputs, and a clear statement of which aspects of the study, article contents, data, or supporting files were affected/generated by AI tool usage.

In cases where Large Language Model (LLM) AI tools or technologies contribute to generating text content for a BJGG submission, the article's authors are responsible for ensuring that:

- the content is accurate and valid,
- there are no concerns about potential plagiarism,
- all relevant sources are cited,
- all statements in the article reporting hypotheses, interpretations, results, conclusions, limitations, and implications of the study represent the authors' own ideas.

The use of AI tools and technologies to fabricate or otherwise misrepresent primary research data is unacceptable.

Noncompliance with any aspect of this policy will be considered misrepresentation of methods, contributions, and/or results. If

concerns arise about noncompliance with this policy, BJGG may notify the authors' institution(s) and the journal may reject (pre-publication), retract (post- publication), or publish an editorial notice on the article.

Author requirements

Authors are obligated to disclose whether the study is subject to consideration as dual use research of concern at the time of submission. Authors should also identify the Institutional Review Entity or equivalent committee(s) granting approval for the study, as well as providing the approval number if one was obtained.

Editor and reviewer requirements

Editors and reviewers are expected to evaluate potential risks and alert the journal with any concerns.

Policy enforcement

Manuscripts are checked at submission for any potential risks. Issues identified at submission may lead to rejection of the manuscript.

If risks are identified after publication of an article, we will take steps to minimize that risk in accordance with prevailing guidelines. We may follow up with authors' institutions depending on the severity of the issues.