

Farmington Consensus Inventory 2015



TOM BABOR

Farmington Consensus



- First drafted in 1997 by ISAJE founding journal editors at a planning meeting in Farmington, Connecticut, USA
- Endorsed by ISAJE founding journal editors and all new members
- A set of principles that describe basic editorial policies for peer reviewed journals in the addiction field

ISAJE Farmington Consensus Audit



- Part of the ISAJE Quality Assurance responsibilities
- Approved unanimously by ISAJE general membership in 2013
- Conducted initially by an internet review of all ISAJE member journals and a selected group of non-member journals
- Followed by a 2014-15 survey of ISAJE member journal editors and online open access journal editors.

**Table 1 – Farmington Consensus
Criteria Pertaining to Peer Review
(ISAJE Journals English = 15; Non-English = 5**

	yes responses in %	
	English	Non-English
Are reports and reviews managed by a peer review process?	100.0	100.0
Are the policies governing the peer review process publically declared?	93.3	100.0
Are referees told in written communication that access to papers for their comment is given in strict confidence?	86.7	80.0
Are referees told in written communication that confidentiality should not be broken by pre-publication statements on the content of the submission?	73.3	40.0
Are referees asked to declare to the editor if they have a conflict of interest in relation to the material reviewed & if in doubt, to consult the editor?	80.0	80.0

Table 2 – Farmington Consensus Criteria Pertaining to Authorship
(English journals 15; Non-English 5)



Authorship, yes responses in %			
	English	Non-English	
Do the Instructions to Authors ask all listed authors to declare they have been personally and substantially involved in the work leading to the paper?	93.3	60.0	
Are authors told they must declare that no significant part of submitted material has been published previously nor concurrently being considered by another journal?	93.3	80.0	

**Table 3 – Farmington Consensus Criteria Pertaining to Conflict of Interest/Funding Declarations
(English journals 15; Non-English 5)**



Funding Sources, yes responses in %			
	English	Non-English	
Are authors asked to declare funding sources for the writing the article or the conduct of the research?	100.0	60.0	
Are authors asked to declare if their relationship with any type of funding source might be fairly construed as exposing them to potential conflict of interest?	93.3	40.0	
Where applicable, are authors asked to give assurance of ethical safeguards and approval by an Ethical Review Committee?	100.0	80.0	

**Table 4 – Farmington Consensus
Criteria Pertaining to Journal Policies
(English journals 15; Non-English 5)**



	English	Non-English	
Does your journal have defined policies for attempted or actual duplicate publication, plagiarism, or scientific fraud?	46.7	40.0	
Does journal require that sources of support from the alcohol, tobacco, pharmaceutical or other relevant interests be published?	60.0 (13.3 missing)	40.0	
Does your journal publish declarations on sources of support received by the editorial staff?	53.3	80.0	
Does your journal recommend that authors follow specific guidelines in the preparation of their articles. If so, which ones are specified?	47.7	40.0	

**Table 4 – Farmington Consensus
Criteria Pertaining to Supplements
(English journals 31; Non-English 3 (N=34))**



Supplements, Frequencies of responses in %			
	English	Non- English	
Does your journal publish supplements?			
Yes	53.3	0.0	
No	26.6	60.0	
Don't publish supplements	13.3	40.0	
Missing	6.7	0.0	
If your journal publishes supplements, does it publish a statement indicating whether the article was peer reviewed?			
Yes	26.7	0.0	
No	46.7	20.0	
Don't publish supplements	26.7	80.0	

ISAJE Farmington Consensus Audit: Conclusions and Next Steps



- Continue to verify information through personal contacts with editors
- Prepare a report for ISAJE Executive Board and ISAJE membership, without identifying individual member's data
- Notify editors of deficiencies in their policies and procedures and suggest ways to improve compliance
- Notify editors when they are in complete compliance with Farmington Consensus
- Consider using audit mechanism to increase prestige of member journals “certified” to be in complete compliance?

Problems with Addiction Journals Affiliated with Predatory Publishers and Other Non-ISAJE, OA, online, for-profit journals

- Dramatic increase in past decade (N=20)
- Most did not respond to PAS3 Editors Survey
- Many (N=9) have no identifiable editor
- Some falsely list indexing/abstracting services
- Many list Google as one of their indexing/abstracting services

Issues for Further Discussion



ISAJE Editor Member Survey Responses



Importance to the Journal Editor, Frequencies in %

	Very important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not important	Missing
Ethical issues and conflict of interests					
English	73.3	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Non-English	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Improvement of publication practices generally					
English	66.7	20.0	13.3	0.0	0.0
Non-English	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Improving and streamlining the peer review process					
English	60.0	20.0	13.3	6.7	0.0
Non-English	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0

ISAJE Editor Member Survey Responses



Systems for managing journals	Very important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not important	Missing
English	40.0	13.3	33.3	6.7	6.7
Non-English	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Information about Impact Factor and Abstracting and indexing services					
English	46.7	33.3	13.3	6.7	0.0
Non-English	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Terminology and language issues					
English	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Non-English	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0

ISAJE Editor Member Survey Responses



Role of Non-English language Journals in addiction science	Very important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not important	Missing
English	33.3	26.7	20.0	20.0	0.0
Non-English	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Training activities for doctoral students and postdocs (young authors)					
English	46.7	20.0	20.0	13.3	0.0
Non-English	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
Economic and financial issues in journal management					
English	33.3	26.7	33.3	6.7	0.0
Non-English	20.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	0.0

ISAJE Editor Member Survey Responses



Face-to-face discussion and opportunities to meet with other editors	Very important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not important	Missing
English	65.0	20.0	6.7	6.7	0.0
Non-English	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
Open access developments					
English	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
Non-English	40.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
Predatory Publishers and their impact on the field					
English	33.3	40.0	26.7	0.0	0.0
Non-English	20.0	40.0	0.0	40.0	0.0

ISAJE Editor Member Survey Responses



Education and training in the Addiction field	Very important	Moderately important	Somewhat important	Not important	Missing
English	53.3	13.3	20.0	15.3	0.0
Non-English	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
Certification of member journals to assure that they comply with minimum publication standards					
English	46.7	13.3	40.0	0.0	0.0
Non-English	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

ISAJE Editor Member Survey Responses

