The question arises whether disclosure by reviewers serves authors, readers, or editors. In general, it benefits the editors directly, allowing better evaluation of reviews in the assessment of an article's value. Indirect benefits accrue to authors and readers, though the confidential nature of the peer review process does not allow publication or dissemination of the reviewers' identities or their conflicts. Our goal is to have a rigorous peer review system, as free from bias as is possible in such a human endeavor.

Full disclosure is ideal, but there are practical limitations. For the most part, we believe that asking peer reviewers to fill out a detailed disclosure form would hamper our efforts to obtain reviewers. The nature of the peer review process is that it is the editors' responsibility to review and appraise the reviewers. It is usually, though not always, possible for an Editor to detect bias in a review. What is the best middle ground? We agree that reviewers should disclose any potential conflicts of interest—financial or personal—that may bias their evaluations of manuscripts. To this end, we have recently strengthened wording in our invitation letter to reviewers to emphasize the importance of disclosing conflicts when

they agree to review. In this letter, we state the situations in which a conflict of interest is most likely:

- Having a financial interest in the publication or nonpublication of a paper
- Having a recent or ongoing collaboration with the author(s)
- Having a history of dispute (more than normal competition) with the authors

We also refer potential reviewers to our newly developed online Information for Reviewers (http://www.neurology.org/site/misc/info_review.xhtml), in which *Neurology's* concern about conflicts of interest is more fully expressed. A reviewer who has conflicts and chooses to review a paper without making disclosure, if found out, will suffer the embarrassing consequences of doing so.

P.K. Baskin, MS, St. Paul, MN; D.S. Knopman, MD, FAAN, Rochester, MN; K. Pieper, S. Quimby, R.A. Gross, MD, PhD, FAAN, Rochester, NY

Disclosure: See original article for full disclosure list.

Copyright © 2011 by AAN Enterprises, Inc.

1. Knopman DS, Baskin PK, Pieper KM, Quimby SL, Gross RA. Reporting potential bias: *Neurology's* evolving policies. *Neurology* 2011;76:110–112.

CORRECTION

Phenotype in parkinsonian and nonparkinsonian *LRRK2* G2019S mutation carriers

In the article "Phenotype in parkinsonian and nonparkinsonian *LRRK2* G2019S mutation carriers" by C. Marras et al. (*Neurology*® 2011;77:325–333), the second author's name was misspelled and should read B. Schüle. The authors regret the error.

Neurology[®]

Phenotype in parkinsonian and nonparkinsonian *LRRK2* G2019S mutation carriers

Neurology 2011;77;1501

DOI 10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182306ab3

This information is current as of October 10, 2011

Updated Information & Services

including high resolution figures, can be found at:
<http://n.neurology.org/content/77/15/1501.full>

Permissions & Licensing

Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or in its entirety can be found online at:
http://www.neurology.org/about/about_the_journal#permissions

Reprints

Information about ordering reprints can be found online:
<http://n.neurology.org/subscribers/advertise>

Neurology® is the official journal of the American Academy of Neurology. Published continuously since 1951, it is now a weekly with 48 issues per year. Copyright Copyright © 2011 by AAN Enterprises, Inc.. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 0028-3878. Online ISSN: 1526-632X.