

## Review of Opinions and Summary Reports Guideline

The American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists (AAPS) has established a position of leadership among pharmaceutical scientists such that the opinions of AAPS groups and summary reports from AAPS-sponsored events may be disseminated. This guideline provides a general framework by which such opinions should be communicated, posted, or published, and the process by which the association will review such items for approval.

### Intent of the Guideline

The scientific content of opinions by AAPS groups, or of summary reports from AAPS-sponsored events, is not the specific purview of AAPS. But to ensure that such reports reflect the majority of scientific views on the topic being discussed or described, it is the specific charge of the AAPS Executive Council to ensure that an appropriate process has been followed to achieve scientific consensus.

This guideline details the process to ensure the content represents a viewpoint that is expressed by the majority of the authoring body, and reflects the general scientific views of association members.

### Guideline for Development

1. This guideline covers workshop reports, consensus documents, white papers, books, chapters, or any other written item that is intended to summarize the major findings and content of an opinion generated by an AAPS group or summarize the findings and content of an AAPS-sponsored event. This guideline applies to any group sponsored in whole or in part by AAPS, and applies to any event sponsored in whole or in part by AAPS.
2. The purpose of these items should be to represent the best-founded scientific data and majority opinion of the scientists of the association. The content must be based upon the data and opinions formed during discussion at AAPS group meetings and events and not of an individual or select subgroup of individuals. Proceedings or compilations of scientific information by individual author(s) and contributor(s) do not fall under this guideline.
3. This guideline should be distributed to all members of the organizing committee at the outset of planning for any event or at the outset of any group deliberation. AAPS agreements to cosponsor a group or an event should state the requirement for AAPS to follow this guideline on any summary report or opinion.
4. The document should be written by the organizing committee of the event or a core group of participants in the forum from which the opinion emanates. An appropriate acknowledgment of all key contributors must be included in the work.
5. To the extent possible, prior to AAPS events or group meetings where an opinion or report is likely or is planned, group members who will write and review the item should be designated.
6. When feasible and in the best interest of the target audience, AAPS journals should be designed as the preferred vehicle for dissemination.
7. The summary report or opinion should have one key individual identified as the corresponding author. But a group of key individuals should be identified with expertise in the scientific area of specialty. These should include, when applicable, the participants from the event or group process and key scientists knowledgeable in the specific area.
8. The report or opinion should be widely distributed in draft form to a number of different individuals to be sure that all perspectives of AAPS are represented. In particular, the draft document should be sent to the chair of any AAPS Section, Committee, Discussion Group, or Focus Group within the scope of the general knowledge and review of the scientific content. A reasonable timeframe for review must be allowed: at least one week but

generally not more than three weeks. A list should be prepared of people who participated in the writing and the review of the report/opinion.

### **Guideline for AAPS Review**

1. A review form should be submitted with the final draft of the document for approval.
2. If the document is to be published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, the corresponding author should submit it to an AAPS journal or, if to a non-AAPS journal, first to the AAPS director of publications. If the document is to be published, disseminated, or communicated other than in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, such as a website open for public comment, then the principal contact should submit it to the AAPS director of public outreach.
3. If the document is submitted to an AAPS journal, the responsibility to judge its suitability for dissemination rests entirely with that journal's editor-in-chief, who may choose to consult with experts in the field, the chair of the Publications Committee, or the Executive Council, if appropriate. The decision and any feedback will go from the editor-in-chief to the corresponding author.
4. If the document is to be submitted to a non-AAPS journal, the AAPS director of publications will submit the document to the AAPS Executive Council for review and approval, and will convey the decision and any feedback to the corresponding author.
5. If the document is to be published, disseminated, or communicated other than in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, the AAPS director of public outreach will submit the document to the appropriate AAPS section(s) or, if deemed necessary based on subject matter or content, the Executive Council for review and approval based on AAPS guidelines. Once finalized, the document will be submitted by AAPS staff to the appropriate venue. The comments will then be included as an informational item for the AAPS Executive Council at their next meeting or teleconference call, whichever comes first.
6. Submitters are encouraged, but not required, to provide a summary of their comments for inclusion in the AAPS online newsmagazine.

APPROVED by the AAPS Executive Council: \_\_\_\_\_

### **AAPS Opinion or Summary Report for Executive Council Review**

**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AAPS Group or Event:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Consensus Process:**

**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, scientific body, government agency, or other publication will this document be sent to:**

Supporting Documentation (website, white paper, etc.)

**Date Submitted:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**E-Mail Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

*Approved by EC: December 18, 2013; Revisions approved by EC April 20, 2016*