


Report of the NSABB Working Group on Journal Review Policies



October 19, 2010
NSABB Board Meeting

Roster

Voting Members


- Arturo Casadevall
(*Co-chair*)
- Jeffery F. Miller
(*Co-chair*)
- Kenneth I. Berns
- Lynn W. Enquist
- Claire M. Fraser-Liggett
- Christine M. Grant

Federal Liaison Members

- Lawrence Kerr (ODNI)
- Laura Kwinn (HHS/OS)
- Janet K. A. Nicholson
(CDC)
- Erik Prentice (ODNI)
- Rick Weiss (OSTP)


Staff

- | | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| ▪ Dan Davis | ▪ Ori Lev |
| ▪ Symma Finn | ▪ Allison Mistry |
| ▪ Paul Lewis | ▪ Stuart Nightingale |




NSABB JRPWG Aim

1. Engaging science journal editors and publishers on the policies regarding review of dual use research of concern (DURC) in order to learn of journals' experiences with conducting such reviews.
2. Gathering insights on how the NSABB guidance could be improved.
3. Continuing to raise awareness within the scientific publishing community about dual use research of concern.




JRPWG Objectives

- Gain understanding of current practices in conducting reviews of manuscripts for content with dual use potential.
- Solicit input from journal editors and publishers on the current NSABB guidance.
- Continue to raise awareness about DURC.
- Provide information and support in order to facilitate the incorporation of current or novel practices for review of research for possible DURC into the policies of publishing scientific literature.



JRPWG Tasks


1. Consideration of Previous NSABB Work
 - *Strategic Plan for Outreach and Education on Dual Use Research Issues (2008)*
 - *Proposed Framework for the Oversight of Dual Use Life Sciences Research (2007)*
 - Reports from the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Int'l Roundtables
 - Journal Editor's Roundtable (June 2006)
2. Review of Current Journal Policies
 - Journal's current review practices
 - Instructions to authors
 - Instructions to reviewers





JRPWG Tasks

3. Discussions with Journal Editors and Publishers
 - 10-15 one-on-one discussions with journal editors and publishers
 - Focused on the process and outcomes of the review

4. Journal Editors Roundtable
 - Bringing together leading Editors and Publishers
 - Focus is on lessons learned and better/'best' practices
 - January 13, 2011




JRPWG Timeline



Activities to Date


1. Review of Current Policies

- Online survey of select journals and publishing related organizations.
 - Anecdotal, not systematic, but reveals various practices.
 - Practices of reviewing for dual use contents vary across journals.




Review of Current Policies - *Nature*


- *Nature Publishing Group* has adopted a policy on DURC that applies only to those journals that include “Nature” in their title.
 - Dual use Review is done by the editors and if needed expert advice is sought.
 - Reviewers and Authors are not asked to identify dual use potential.



Review of Current Policies - *Science*

- *Science*, published by AAAS and HighWire Press, has a policy that requires that authors and reviewers alert the editors to any DURC potential
 - The editors might ask expert opinion to determine a course of action.
 - This policy does not apply to other AAAS publications.






National Research Council Canada Research Press

- **National Research Council Canada Research Press**, publishes 17 journals and has a statement on security as part of its review process.
 - In this process the editors are responsible for assessing DURC potential.
 - The procedure is not fully detailed.

Review of Current Policies – *Major Themes*


- **Some** journals ask **authors** to assess dual use potential.
- **Some** journals ask **reviewers** to assess dual use potential.
- **Some** journals call on **expert opinion** to assess for dual use potential.
- **Most** journals ask their **associate and senior editors** to do an initial screening for dual use potential.
- If editors see grounds for concern, **managing editor and editor in chief** get called upon.
- **No** journal has a policy on manuscripts that raise dual use concerns but are rejected on scientific merit.



Activities to Date

2. One-on-one Discussions with Editors

- Discussion Framework Components:
 - Current position or policy on review of manuscripts for dual use content
 - The process of review
 - Outcomes & impacts of the reviews
 - Actions taken
 - Changes over time
 - Lessons learned
 - Utility of the NSABB's communication tool
 - Needs for further guidance



Activities to Date – Discussions with Editors

- Journal selection

- Knowledge of various fields

- Impact factor, eigenfactor, rankings

- *Cell*

- *EMBO*

- *Emerging Infectious Diseases*

- *Infection and Immunity*

- *Journal of Biological Chemistry*

- *Nature*

- ***PNAS***

- *Science*

- *Biochemistry*

- *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism*

- *Cellular Microbiology*

- *Clinical Infectious Diseases*

- *JAMA*


- *Microbiology*

- *Molecular Microbiology*

- *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association & American Journal of Veterinary Research*


- *Toxicological Sciences*

- *Veterinary Record*





Activities to Date – Discussions with Editors

- Discussions to date:
 - ASM
 - APS
 - *PNAS*
 - More currently being scheduled
- Preliminary Findings
 - Different models are working
 - Few instances of concern
 - Need for guidance




Upcoming: Journal Editors' Roundtable



**January 13, 2011
Bethesda, MD**


2011 Editors' Roundtable

- Target Participants: 10-15 Editors of leading bioscience journals
- Representation areas to consider:
 - Journals with & without a DUR review policy
 - Highly influential & highly publishing journals
 - Member organizations: ICMJE, WAME, CSE
 - Publishers
 - Others: NLM



Goals of 2011 Roundtable

- Obtain information on current practices in conducting reviews of manuscripts for content with dual use potential
 - Process of a DURC review
 - Lessons learned
 - Good/better/'best' practices
- Identify key issues and challenges
- Solicit input regarding needed guidance.



JRPWG

Thank you

Any questions?

