



Monday, February 23, 2026

Thanks to Nancy Chescheir for publishing this statement, and even more, thanks for taking this position.

Now I hope it is followed by more journals. I write because I am concerned that too many editors and journals are publishing government orthodoxies that buries independent work that takes unorthodox positions.

I have long been concerned with government placing political pressure on agency scientists — or on independent researchers seeking funding from government agencies— to publish only what conforms to policy positions and avoid anything that looks unorthodox. That includes agency scientists using selective citations claims of authority, and non-transparency about methods and data.

Through the peer review process I have tried to alert editors to the symptoms of agency orthodoxy permeating the literature in my subfield:

- a. Superiors approving their manuscripts
- b. Agencies not allowing all data to be shared (this is often achieved by claiming privacy of records) or the unenforceable ‘Authors will share data upon appropriate requests’ or similar evasions that leave interpretation of appropriate to the authors or political superiors.
- c. Selective citation to the literature wherein only politically approved citations are cited and reams of contrary literature are buried.
- d. Claims of authority, government reports as truth, or the experience of authors. This extends to rebutting the unorthodox work with such claims, then claiming a peer-reviewed rebuttal has debunked or refuted the unorthodox work when all the government agents have done is reassert the unsubstantiated government dogma.
- e. Incomplete disclosures of potentially competing interests. Government scientists failing to note if superiors must approve their work or if their jobs depend on fidelity to party politics. This is not surprising but if editors ignore the possibility, it could make a mockery of disclosures.

I have not seen much effect of my efforts as a peer reviewer to combat the above in my subfield.

Therefore I call upon editors and publishers to do more to interrogate the agency process of writing, vetting, approving, and submitting science.

Finding no other outlet for my concerns, I turned to guest editorials in a prominent journal in my field:

Editorials on research integrity

[Treves, A., Fisher, A.R. 2026.](#)

A code of ethics for peer reviewers. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (guest editorial) Early view 2026 <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.70032>.

[Treves, A. 2025.](#)

A court decision on endangered species holds lessons for us all. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (guest editorial) 23(8):e70006.



[Treves, A. 2024.](#)

Authors declare no competing interests—really? *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (guest editorial) 22(5): e2772

[Treves, A. 2023.](#)

Replace the ivory tower with the fire tower. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (guest editorial) p.355, doi:10.1002/fee.2676

[Treves, A. 2022.](#)

'Best available science' and the reproducibility crisis. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (guest editorial) 20(9):495, <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2568>

[Treves, A. 2019.](#)

Scientific ethics and the illusion of naïve objectivity. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (guest editorial) 7:1.

Thanks for considering,

Adrian Treves, PhD
Professor of Environmental Studies
+1-608-890-1450
Zoom: <https://uwmadison.zoom.us/my/adriantreves>
<http://faculty.nelson.wisc.edu/treves/>