








IARD Principles of Scientific Integrity

The International Alliance for Responsible Drinking's (IARD) Science and Policy team is committed to the highest standards of scientific quality and ethical integrity in its work. IARD does not conduct or commission primary academic research, the team analyzes and collects published [scientific studies](#) and produces a range of alcohol-related resources. Together, these resources aim to offer a referenced overview of recent peer-reviewed research and regulatory developments. However, as research continues to evolve, these resources may not always reflect the most recent findings and may not be exhaustive representations of all scientific work on a given subject. The team also [provides public access to data](#) from economic operators. The following principles, adapted from academic and governmental institutions, guide IARD's approach and commitment to the objectivity and integrity of the scientific process in our work.

Principle	Definition	How IARD implements it
 Objectivity (Independence)	Objectivity involves emphasizing unbiased research practices by posing refutable hypotheses, testing them rigorously, and clearly reporting results to ensure reproducibility. Cognitive biases, institutional pressures, or personal desires for specific outcomes can compromise objectivity. [1]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Science and Policy team operates as an independent team and is not directed by IARD members in the design, conduct, or reporting of its analytical tasks. Comprehensive details about IARD's research database are provided (About), including search parameters and inclusion/exclusion criteria.
 Honesty (Accuracy)	Accuracy requires truthful reporting of data, methods, and findings. It prohibits fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, and subtle forms of dishonesty that involve omitting relevant information or misrepresenting sources, including funding. [1, 2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data catalogs and tables on study characteristics follow the PECOTS (population, exposure, comparators, outcome, time, and study design) framework for each study included in a review. Evidence master documents support every statement in our reviews, tying our statement to corresponding text and findings in each referenced source. We disclose the scope and methods used for all of our analyses including reviews, reports, data visualizations. We adhere to best practices for data visualization and presentation (in reviews, reports, policy tables).
 Transparency	To uphold trust and credibility, transparency requires disclosing the decision-making process and funding sources and team independence. It requires receptiveness to critical feedback and differing ideas, fostering collaboration and knowledge advancement. [2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IARD discloses its membership and funding sources on its website, on individual publicly available resources and publications, and in presentations and other public engagements. The Science and Policy team conducts and reports its analytical work independently from IARD members.

Continued on next page

 <p>Reproducibility</p>	<p>Reproducibility involves the clear and accessible sharing of data, research strategies, and methodologies to support verification. It includes thorough documentation of processes and detailed reporting of approaches, which enables replication. [3]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We document our literature and regulatory search strategies (reviews, reports, policy tables) • IARD's review process is described on its public website. • We document PRISMA flow diagram results for reviews. • We provide detailed descriptions of our methodology and cite the primary sources for all data or information used in all of our resources (reviews, reports, policy tables).
 <p>Fairness</p>	<p>Fairness requires unbiased judgment in professional evaluations, such as peer review, funding decisions, and the allocation of authorship credit. It involves recognizing all contributors appropriately, avoiding favoritism, and applying clear criteria and processes in research. [1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We engage external experts who review our work on a voluntary basis. • We incorporate globally or nationally recognized expert resources on issues such as TB, HIV, cancer, and heart disease to ensure objective and well-founded analysis. • We scrupulously reference back to primary sources for each fact or figure (reports, reviews, policy tables).
 <p>Accountability</p>	<p>Accountability involves researchers taking responsibility for their work, actions, and decisions. Findings should be accurate, and methods should be sound. Accountability also includes correcting errors when and where they occur. In doing so, this cultivates trust among peers, the public, and various interested parties, including colleagues, institutions, funders, and society. [1, 2]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IARD resources identify the organization or individual authors and provide contact information for correspondence (reviews, reports, policy tables). • We provide accessible contact information for reporting errors (reports, reviews, policy tables).
 <p>Stewardship</p>	<p>Responsible management of resources, relationships, and research is crucial. Researchers are expected to contribute to the community through peer review, mentorship, and support for evidence-based policies. Stewardship involves addressing systemic issues in research and promoting education and awareness. [1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We include future research sections in our reviews that identify limitations and outline strategies for addressing these issues. • We maintain accurate and up-to-date information by regularly updating reviews, managing the regulatory database, and removing outdated reviews (reviews, reports, research database, policy tables). • We provide datasets as received from market research companies for open access by the research community.

References

1. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM). (2017). Foundations of integrity in research: Core values and guiding norms (doi:doi:10.17226/21896). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
2. UK Committee on Research Integrity (UKCORI). (2025). The concordat to support research integrity. Retrieved from <https://ukcori.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/The-Concordat-to-Support-Research-Integrity-2025.pdf>
3. House of Commons Science Innovation and Technology Committee. (2023). Reproducibility and research integrity. London: House of Commons.