Consensus Report Review and Publishing Guidelines

Introduction

The American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists (AAPS) has established a position of leadership among pharmaceutical scientists such that the content of consensus reports from workshops and other programs offered by the association are published. This guideline is intended to provide a general framework by which such reports should be published and the process by which the Executive Council (EC) of the Association will review and approve such publications.

Intent of the Guidelines

The explicit scientific content of consensus or meeting reports is not the specific purview of the EC. However, to assure that such reports reflect the majority of scientific views on the topic being discussed or described, it is the specific charge of the EC to assure that an appropriate process has been followed to achieve scientific consensus. Therefore, this guideline details the process by which the content can be assured to represent a viewpoint that is expressed by the majority of the authoring body and reflects the general scientific views of the members of the association.

Guideline for Publication

1. Publications include workshop reports, consensus documents, white papers, or any other written document (hereafter called document) that is intended to summarize the major findings and content of a meeting or educational program in any format, sponsored in whole or in part by AAPS. The main thrust of these documents should be to represent the best-founded scientific data and majority opinion of the scientists of the association. The content must be based upon data and opinions formed during discussion at the AAPS-sponsored event and not of a select subgroup of individuals or from post-event refinement, unless there was a specific agreement by event participants to post-hoc refinements.
2. Proceedings or compilations of scientific information by individual author(s) and contributor(s) do not fall under this guideline.
3. The document should be written by a core group of individuals that participated in the AAPS event upon which the work is founded. An appropriate acknowledgment of all key contributors must be included in the work.
4. To the extent possible prior to AAPS events where a publication is likely or is planned, principal group members who will write and review the document should be explicitly identified by the meeting organizers and planning committee.
5. AAPS publications should be the preferred vehicle for dissemination. Publication of such documents, which bear explicit or implicit AAPS sponsorship or involvement, in non-AAPS publications, must be submitted for prior approval by the EC.

Guideline for Review

1. This set of guidelines shall be distributed to all members of the organizing committee at the beginning stage of program planning.
2. The document should have one key individual~~s~~ identified as the principal contact (corresponding author). However, the submitted draft for publication must be approved

Approved by AAPS Executive Council: September, 2000
Updated and Approved by AAPS Executive Council: July, 2004
Updated and Approved by AAPS Executive Council: May 16, 2007

by all co-authors, and documentation of such approval should be submitted along with the draft document. The manner by which such approval is transmitted shall be determined by AAPS.

3. Normally, the co-authors of the document should include all members of the program organizers and planning committee. The corresponding author should indicate if and when such members are omitted in co-authorship, and the reason for omission. If the reason concerns scientific disagreement, then a minority report should be submitted, and reviewed by the entire authorship.
4. When the document is submitted to an AAPS journal, the responsibility to judge its suitability for publication rests entirely with the relevant editor-in-chief, who, at her/his discretion, may consult with experts in the field, the Chair of the Publications Committee or the EC, if appropriate.
5. The EC may intervene in this process, prior to publication, if concerns are brought to its attention.

APPROVED by the AAPS Executive Council: _____

Approved by AAPS Executive Council: September, 2000
Updated and Approved by AAPS Executive Council: July, 2004
Updated and Approved by AAPS Executive Council: May 16, 2007

AAPS Consensus Report Executive Council Review

Title: _____
Primary Contact: _____

AAPS Event that is the source of the content:
_____

<u>Consensus Process:</u>
Collaborators in Document Preparation: (list name and AAPS position, if any)

Reviewers of the Scientific Content: (list name and AAPS position, if any)

What journal or publication will this document be sent to:
_____

Contact Information:
Date Submitted: _____
Name: _____ Phone: _____
E-Mail Address: _____

Approved by AAPS Executive Council: September, 2000
Updated and Approved by AAPS Executive Council: July, 2004
Updated and Approved by AAPS Executive Council: May 16, 2007