



# JOURNAL OF THE IRISH DENTAL ASSOCIATION POLICIES





# CONTENTS

<i>Journal of the Irish Dental Association</i> .....	4
Editorial Board October 2020 .....	4
Statement of editorial policies .....	5
Statement of policies on conflict of interest, human and animal rights and informed consent .....	8
Guidelines For Authors .....	10
Guidelines For Authors – Clinical features .....	12
Research data policy for the <i>Journal of the Irish Dental Association</i> .....	13
Advertising policy .....	13
Think Media protocol for handling retractions, withdrawals, and expressions of concern .....	14

# JOURNAL OF THE IRISH DENTAL ASSOCIATION

## Aims and scope

The *Journal of the Irish Dental Association (JIDA)* is a peer-reviewed journal, and is the flagship publication of the Irish Dental Association.

The *JIDA*'s readership includes general dentists, specialists, and academics, as well as other members of the dental team. The *JIDA* aims to inform readers of new research, ideas, opinions, developments and key issues in dentistry – clinical, practical and scientific – stimulating interest, debate and discussion, in keeping with the Irish Dental Association's stated aim to promote the advancement of the interests of the dental profession and the well-being of the population through the attainment of optimum oral health. The *JIDA* achieves these aims through:

- peer-reviewed scientific articles;
- clinical features;
- practice management articles;
- news features on topics of interest to Irish dentistry; and,
- interviews with leading figures in dentistry and healthcare in Ireland and internationally.

The *JIDA* is published bimonthly, with six editions published per year, and its circulation to every dentist on the island of Ireland is audited and verified by the Audit Bureau of Circulations (ABC).

## EDITORIAL BOARD OCTOBER 2020

### Honorary Editor

Dr Ciara Scott BDS MFD MOrth MDentCh (TCD) FFD (RCSI) MSc (RCSI) FDS (RCSEd) Member EBO

### Deputy Editor

Dr Siobhain Davis BA BDentSc FDS (RCSI) MDentCh (Pros) FFD (RCSI) MSc LHPE (RCSI)

### Editorial Board

Dr Mirza Shahzad Baig BDS MSc (UK) PhD (TCD)

AnnMarie Bergin RDH

Dr Evelyn Crowley BDS (NUI) MSc (ULond) DDPHRCSEng MSc (TCD)

Dr Brian Dunne BA BDentSc DipPCD (RCSI) MFD (RCSI)

Dr Máiréad Harding BDS MDPH PhD MFGDP (UK) FDS RCPS (Glasg) PGDipTLHE

Dr Peter Harrison BDentSc MFD DChDent

Dr Laura Kavanagh BDS Dip Clin Dent

Dr Richard Lee Kin BDentSc FDSRCSI DChDent (Periodontology)

Dr Geraldine McDermott BA BDentSc MFDS RCSI PGradDip ConSed MSc Healthcare Leadership

Dr Mark Joseph McLaughlin BDentSc FFD (RCSI) DChDent (Periodontics)

Dr David McReynolds BA BDentSc MFDS RCSEd DChDent (Pros) FFD RCSI

Dr Deborah O'Reilly BA BDentSc

# STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL POLICIES

The *Journal of the Irish Dental Association (JIDA)* aims to publish high-quality papers in all areas of dental research. This *Journal* facilitates the research and wishes to publish papers as long as they are technically correct and scientifically motivated. The *Journal* also encourages the submission of useful reports of negative results. This is a quality controlled, peer-reviewed, international journal. Every volume of this *Journal* will consist of six issues. Every issue will have two peer-reviewed papers or ten to twelve pages of peer-reviewed contents.

## GENERAL EDITORIAL POLICY

### Publication criteria

1. The paper has not been published (partly or as a whole) before or is not under consideration for publication elsewhere (except as an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis). We will consider manuscripts that have been deposited in preprint servers such as arXiv or published in institutional repositories. We will also consider work that has been presented at conferences (a significant amount of changes should be made before submission to the *Journal* and proper citation of the conference paper is required). Submission of a manuscript clearly indicates that authors grant a license to publish the article and identify itself as the original publisher. The submitting author (corresponding author) is responsible for ensuring that the article's publication has been approved by all the other co-authors and after the publication of the paper author dispute-related issues will not be entertained. It is also the corresponding authors' responsibility to ensure that the articles emanating from a particular institution are submitted with the approval of the necessary institution.
2. Its publication is permitted by all authors and after acceptance for publication, it will not be submitted for publication anywhere else, in English or in any other language, without the written approval of the copyright holder. The *Journal* may consider manuscripts that are translations of articles originally published in another language. In this case, the consent of the journal in which the article was originally published must be obtained and the fact that the article has already been published must be made clear on submission and stated in the abstract.
3. It is compulsory for the authors to ensure that no material submitted as part of a manuscript infringes existing copyrights or the rights of a third party.
4. The copyrights of all papers published in this *Journal* are retained by the respective authors as per the 'Creative Commons Attribution License' (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). The author(s) should be the sole author(s) of the article and should have full authority to enter into the agreement and in granting rights (if any) which are not in breach of any other obligation. The author(s) should ensure the integrity of the paper and related works. Authors should mandatorily ensure that submission of the manuscript

to this *Journal* would result in no breach of contract or of confidence or of commitment given to secrecy.

5. If a submitted study replicates or is very similar to previous work, authors must provide a sound scientific rationale for the submitted work and clearly reference and discuss the existing literature. Submissions that replicate or are derivative of existing work will likely be rejected if authors do not provide adequate justification.
6. English quality: the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. It is author's responsibility to improve the English quality (if required) by any other third-party service.
7. The research must meet all applicable standards for the ethics of experimentation and research integrity.
8. This publisher believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. The *Journal* will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish papers that are judged to be technically sound.

### Agreement for authorship

Submission of a paper to this *Journal* indicates that the author(s) have agreed on the content of the paper. One author should be indicated as the corresponding author for all publication-related communications. All correspondence and proofs would be sent to the corresponding author, who will be treated as a final representative voice for all authors regarding any decision related to the manuscript unless otherwise requested during submission. This *Journal* would not be responsible for any dispute related to authorship of a submitted paper. Any change in the authorship (such as addition or deletion of author(s) or change in the sequence of author list) should be intimated to the editorial office through a letter signed by all authors before publication of the paper. Generally, any change in the authorship after final publication is not entertained.

## PEER REVIEW MECHANISM

### Reviewer selection

Reviewer selection is a critical parameter to maintain the high peer-review standard of any journal. Many factors are considered during peer reviewer selection like: proof of expertise in terms of published papers in the same area in reputed journals, affiliation, and reputation, specific suggestion, etc. We try to avoid reviewers who are slow, careless or do not provide sufficient justification for their decision (positive or negative). We also, as much as possible, try to rule out those reviewers who may have an obvious competing interest.

The main force behind our efficient and quality peer-review system is the tremendous hard work of our peer reviewers, administration team and editors. We are extremely grateful to them for their great service.

### Review process flow

The reviewers' comments are generally sent to authors within three weeks after submission. With the help of the reviewers' comments, a final decision (accepted; accepted with minor revisions; accepted with major revision; or, rejected) will be sent to the corresponding author. Reviewers are asked if they would like to review a revised version of the manuscript. The editorial office may request a re-review regardless of a reviewer's response in order to ensure a thorough and fair evaluation. Reviewers who may have offered an opinion not in accordance with the final decision should not feel that their recommendation was not duly considered and their service not properly appreciated. Experts often disagree, and it is the job of the editorial team to make a final decision.

Authors are encouraged to submit the revised manuscript within seven to 15 days of receipt of reviewer's comments (in case of minor corrections). But in any case, the revised manuscript submission should not go beyond eight weeks (only for the cases of major revision, which involves additional experiment, analysis, etc.). The Editor of the *Journal* will have exclusive power to take the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of a manuscript during the peer-review process.

The *Journal* is determined to promote integrity in research publication. In case of any suspected misconduct, *Journal* management will reserve the right to re-review any manuscript at any stage before final publication.

### General guidelines for the peer-review process

- This *Journal* strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. If a reviewer suspects any unethical practice in a manuscript, they are encouraged to write it in the report with some proof/web links.
- Studies which are carried out to reconfirm/replicate the results of any previously published paper with new data may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter.
- This publisher believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound.
- Materials and methods – comments are invited on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described.
- Results and discussion (comments are invited on: 1. are the data well controlled and robust?; 2. authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion; 3. discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures, and biased claims should be pointed out; and, 4. are statistical analyses a must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and

appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)

- Conclusion – is the conclusion supported by the data discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them.
- Are all the references cited relevant and adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This publisher believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language (unnecessarily harsh words may be modified or removed at the Editor's discretion). It is expected that the reviewers should suggest to authors how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach an editorial decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.
- We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.
- Appeal – appeal requests should be made in writing, not by telephone, and should be addressed to [journaleditor@irishdentalassoc.ie](mailto:journaleditor@irishdentalassoc.ie) with the word "appeal" in the subject line. In all these cases, it is likely that some time will elapse before the *Journal* can respond, and the paper must not be submitted for publication elsewhere during this time. Authors should provide detailed reasons for the appeal and point-by-point responses to the reviewers' and/or Editor's comments. Authors should also be aware that priority is given to new submissions to the *Journal* and so the processing of the appeal may well take longer than the processing of the original submission. If an appeal is rejected, further appeals of the decision will not be considered and the paper may not be resubmitted.

### Plagiarism policy

This *Journal* strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism.

This *Journal* aims to publish original high-quality research work. Submission of a manuscript to this *Journal* indicates that the study has not been published anywhere or not been submitted elsewhere for publication. If author(s) are using any part of a published paper (in English or any other language), they should give a proper reference or in any case, if required they should get permission from the previous publisher or copyright holder (whichever is suitable).

Plagiarised manuscripts will not be considered for publication. If plagiarism is found in any published paper after an internal investigation, a letter will be immediately sent to all the authors, their affiliated institutes and funding agencies, and subsequently the paper will be retracted.



The plagiarism policy of this *Journal* is mainly inspired by the plagiarism policy of *Nature*. The plagiarism policy of this *Journal* is described below:

1. Plagiarism is when an author attempts to pass off someone else's work as his or her own. This *Journal* also adopted the IEEE definition of plagiarism to deal with such cases. It defines plagiarism as: "the reuse of someone else's prior ideas, processes, results, or words without explicitly acknowledging the original author and source".
2. Plagiarism can be said to have clearly occurred when large chunks of text have been cut and pasted. Such manuscripts would not be considered for publication in this *Journal*. Papers with confirmed plagiarism are rejected immediately.
3. Minor plagiarism without dishonest intent is relatively frequent, for example, when an author reuses parts of an introduction from an earlier paper.
4. Duplicate publication, sometimes called self-plagiarism, occurs when an author reuses substantial parts of his or her own published work without providing the appropriate references. This can range from getting an identical paper published in multiple journals, to 'salami-slicing', where authors add small amounts of new data to a previous paper. Self-plagiarism, also referred to as 'text recycling', is a topical issue and is currently generating much discussion among editors. Opinions are divided as to how much text overlap with an author's own previous publications is acceptable.
5. In case of 'suspected minor plagiarism', authors are contacted for

clarification. Depending on all these reports, reviewers and editors decide final fate of the manuscript.

6. The Editor has the final decision power for all such cases.

#### Correction and retraction policy

This *Journal* is determined to promote integrity in research publication. As soon as any error or omission is identified, the *Journal* corrects and/or retracts as appropriate at the earliest possible opportunity.

For any queries, authors are requested to contact by email: [journaleditor@irishdentalassoc.ie](mailto:journaleditor@irishdentalassoc.ie).

#### PROTOCOLS

The Editorial Board of the *Journal* has adopted two protocols which continue to be observed. They are:

##### April 10, 2006

The Irish Dental Association will hold onto all information relating to articles submitted for a period of two years after the article is first submitted regardless of whether it is published or not.

##### February 5, 2007

After articles have been published in the *Journal*, a pdf of the article may be put on the author's own website provided that the *Journal* is credited for it.

# STATEMENT OF POLICIES ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST, HUMAN AND ANIMAL RIGHTS AND INFORMED CONSENT

## Conflicts of interest (sometimes referred to as 'competing interests')

These occur when outside issues affect, or are perceived to affect, the neutrality or objectivity of research. This can happen at any stage in the research cycle, including during the experimentation phase, while a manuscript is being written, or during the process of turning a manuscript into a published article.

Conflicts of interest do not always stop work from being published or prevent someone from being involved in the review process. However, they must be declared. A clear declaration of all possible conflicts – whether they actually had an influence or not – allows others to make informed decisions about the work and its review process.

If conflicts of interest are found after publication, this may be embarrassing for the authors, the Editor and the *Journal of the Irish Dental Association*. It may be necessary to publish a corrigendum or reassess the review process.

## Some common conflicts include:

- personal – a pre-existing relationship induces an individual to act inappropriately;
- financial – an individual receives payment relating to the subject of the research, or from connected organisations;
- intellectual property – an individual puts undue emphasis on patents or trademarks that they own, or those owned by their organisation;
- affiliations – an individual is employed by, or is a member of, an organisation with an interest in the outcome of the research; and,
- ideology – an individual is influenced by beliefs or associations relating to the subject of the research.

You should carefully consider how these and other similar topics may affect you, and how they could affect others involved in the handling of the manuscript.

## Authors

Conflicts for authors are most often associated with the risk of bias in a manuscript. As an author, if you have any interest or association that could be seen to have influenced your decision-making process, you should ensure that it is declared at the time of submission.

You may be asked to make certain changes to your manuscript as a result of your declaration. These requests are not an accusation of impropriety. The Editor or reviewer is helping you to protect your work against potential criticisms.

If you are in any doubt about declaring a potential conflict, remember that if it is revealed later – especially after publication – it could cause more problems than simply declaring it at the time of submission. Undeclared conflicts of interest could lead to a corrigendum or, in the most serious cases, a retraction. Whether or not you believe a conflict of interest exists, you will be asked to include a statement in your manuscript. If you believe no conflicts exist, you will be asked to confirm this in writing.

## Editors

As a member of a *Journal's* Editorial Board, you need to be very aware of the risk of conflicts when handling a manuscript.

Firstly, you should assess your own potential conflicts. If you have recently co-authored with the author of the manuscript, you could be perceived to be influenced by your relationship. Similarly, if you have recently shared an affiliation or employment history with the author, it could also be seen to be inappropriate for you to handle their work. The *Journal of the Irish Dental Association* aims to avoid assigning papers to editors who might have conflicts, but we also expect our editors to declare any conflicts. If you believe a conflict exists, you should refuse to handle the manuscript.

As a subject expert, the *Journal* relies on your knowledge of the discipline to assess any conflicts declared by a submitting author. You are also uniquely placed to be able to identify any undeclared conflicts that an author might have. You should think about these factors when making a recommendation on the manuscript.

You should also consider potential conflicts when assigning the manuscript to reviewers.

Discretion may be applied when publications are authored by a consortium. If you have concerns about a potential reviewer, consider appointing someone else. If you believe a reviewer's recommendation on a manuscript was made to further their own interests, you may tell the authors they do not need to address that point.



We are aware that certain specialist areas may involve a higher likelihood of association and overlap between researchers. In some instances, you may be the best-placed individual to act as editor despite a connection with the author or authors. In this case, you should inform them you're on the Editorial Board of the *Journal of the Irish Dental Association*.

### Reviewers

By agreeing to peer review a manuscript you are providing essential neutral assessment. As such, you should ensure that you have no conflicts of interest that could be seen to prevent you from acting in an impartial manner.

The *Journal of the Irish Dental Association* operates a 'double-blind' approach to peer review. Your name will not be made available to the authors and the author's name(s) will not be available to you. This allows you to provide honest, pertinent feedback.

### Human and animal rights

All research must have been carried out within an appropriate ethical framework. If there is the suspicion that work has not taken place within an appropriate ethical framework, editors may reject the manuscript, and/or contact the ethics committee of the author(s). On rare occasions, if the Editor has serious concerns about the ethics of a study, the manuscript may be rejected on ethical grounds, even if approval from an ethics committee has been obtained. Research involving human subjects, human material, or human data, must have been performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and must have been approved by an appropriate ethics committee.

Authors reporting the use of a new procedure or tool in a clinical setting, for example, as a technical advance or case report, must give a clear justification in the manuscript for why the new procedure or tool was deemed more appropriate than usual clinical practice to meet the patient's clinical need. Such a justification is not required if the new procedure is already approved for clinical use at the author's institution. Authors will be expected to have obtained ethics committee approval and informed patient consent for any experimental use of a novel procedure or tool where a clear clinical advantage based on clinical need was not apparent before treatment.

### Informed consent

Inclusion of identifying details and images related to individual participants are not allowed.

Experimental research on vertebrates or any regulated invertebrates must comply with institutional, national, or international guidelines, and where available should have been approved by an appropriate ethics committee.



# GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

The purpose of the *Journal of the Irish Dental Association* is to provide good quality information to support continuing education, professional development and best practice.

We aim to benefit our members, our patients, and the wider dental profession by publishing original research studies, clinical case reports, position papers, literature reviews, brief communications, clinical features, and other material that is of interest to the Irish dental profession.

The following guidelines explain the format in which original material should be submitted to the *Journal of the Irish Dental Association*. This is recommended reading for anyone in the process of submitting material. Failure to follow these guidelines may result in rejection of manuscripts or delays in the review and publication process.

These guidelines address submission of:

- peer-reviewed articles;
- clinical features; and,
- letters to the Editor.

## PEER-REVIEWED ARTICLES

An electronic copy of the article must be submitted to:

The Honorary Editor

The Journal of the Irish Dental Association

Unit 2, Leopardstown Office Park,

Sandyford,

Dublin 18.

Email: [articles@irishdentalassoc.ie](mailto:articles@irishdentalassoc.ie)

All material will be evaluated for publication on the understanding that the work submitted has not been published elsewhere (except as an abstract), that it has not and will not be submitted to another journal until the Editor has made a decision on its acceptability for this *Journal* and that, if accepted, its contents will not be published elsewhere without the Editor's permission.

## Aims and scope

Articles must clearly state the problem and objective of the research, include a summary of relevant literature in the introduction, describe the research method, report the results briefly and accurately, discuss the results, and list the conclusions that can be drawn from the research.

Clinical case reports should briefly describe the particular clinical problem, the author's method of managing the problem, and a rationale for such treatment with appropriate references to the literature. If appropriate, diagrams or descriptions of the differential diagnosis and any specialised tests should be included, to improve understanding for the reader.

Literature reviews should thoroughly analyse the literature with respect to the chosen topic and reference all material used. They should emphasise what the reader can learn and report new, helpful or timesaving techniques or procedures. All accepted manuscripts are subject to editorial revision. The lead/corresponding author will receive edited proofs for approval. The authors will be responsible for all statements in the article, including changes made by the Editor.

## Construction

- From January 1, 2014, papers submitted to the *Journal of the Irish Dental Association* should not exceed 3,000 words.
- The text must be a minimum of 10pt size and double spaced.
- Each page must be numbered in consecutive order from the title page, through the abstract, text, references, tables and photographs in that order.
- The first page, or title page, must contain the title and all the authors' names and affiliations. Dentists registered in the Republic of Ireland must not use any qualifications not registered by them with the Dental Council.
- This page must also give the name, address, phone number and email of the corresponding author, who will undertake correspondence, proofreading, etc.
- Each manuscript must contain a structured abstract of a maximum of 250 words, with the headings: statement of the problem; purpose of the study; materials and methods; results; and, conclusions.
- For the body of the text, the standard headings – introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, conclusions, etc. – should be used.
- References should be from journals that are peer reviewed and indexed in either PubMed or Scopus.
- References must be identified in the text by superscript and numbered consecutively in order of appearance in the text. References appearing in tables only shall be numbered in relation to the first mention of the table in the text. The list of references should be placed at the end of the article and must be numbered as in the text and placed in numerical order. References shall be given according to the Vancouver style. For example:  
**Peres, M.A., Macpherson, L.M., Weyant, R.J., Daly, B., Venturelli, R., Mathur, M.R., et al. Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. *The Lancet* 2019; 394 (10194): 249-260.**
- All tables must be on separate sheets and must have a consecutive number and a clear concise title. Do not duplicate data in tables and text. Include adequate information (using footnotes if necessary) to make the table self-explanatory.
- Pictures should be jpg, pdf or eps files. These electronic images must be at least 300dpi/500kbs and of publishable size. Pictures must not be embedded in the word processing file.
- Radiographs must be of a high quality.



- Figures must be identified with a number in order of their mention in the text.
- All acknowledgments should be concise and include only identification of grant sources and permission to reproduce from previous publications.

#### General instructions

- Spelling should be that of the Oxford Dictionary.
- Avoid excessive use of abbreviations. Authors may use abbreviations that are in common use in scientific literature. They may introduce less familiar acronyms whenever unwieldy terms are repeated in the text. The abbreviation should be introduced (in parentheses) where the term is mentioned first and the abbreviation should be used thereafter. On occasion it may be desirable to list abbreviations as a footnote.
- Authors must disclose any financial interest that they have in products mentioned in their articles or that they will receive compensation from a commercial company upon publication of the article.

#### Multiple-choice questions for CPD

Continuous professional development (CPD) is a significant element of the *Journal's* remit and dental professionals receive CPD points for reading a peer-reviewed article. We have a duty to the Dental Council to ensure that the article is read and understood.

The Editorial Board therefore now requires each lead author to submit three multiple-choice questions on their article, along with the answers. The questions will appear at the end of the article, and readers will need to submit their answers through the IDA website, which will then automatically give them the relevant points, if the questions are answered correctly.

Questions should be factual, ensure synthesis of the article and be fair to any non-expert reading the publication. The questions and answers should be sent to the Journal Co-ordinator at [articles@irishdentalassoc.ie](mailto:articles@irishdentalassoc.ie).

#### Consent

- The corresponding author shall confirm, on behalf of all of the authors, that the content of the manuscript and the authors' names and affiliations are correct.
- A signed consent form shall be submitted by the authors confirming that they:
  - a. have contributed to the authorship of the submitted manuscript;
  - b. have seen and approved the submitted version of the manuscript; and,
  - c. consent to the corresponding author co-ordinating future correspondence between the *Journal* office and the authors.

#### Peer-review process

All manuscripts are reviewed by the Editor, editorial staff and a number of reviewers using a standardised peer-review process. The authors should be sent the reviewers' comments, a decision and any recommended changes by the Honorary Editor within six weeks of submission. The Honorary Editor and publishers reserve the right to make minor editorial changes to accepted manuscripts.

#### CLINICAL FEATURES

The *Journal* also commissions some clinical features to illustrate techniques, new evidence and key learning. These should be two pages and highly visual, and should not be more than 1,000 words. The Honorary Editor welcomes ideas for future features from our readers. Please see separate guidance document for further information.

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Honorary Editor welcomes letters from the profession. Letters should not exceed 350 words and should be submitted to [journaleditor@irishdentalassoc.ie](mailto:journaleditor@irishdentalassoc.ie). Letters will be published subject to space availability on an issue-by-issue basis. The Honorary Editor reserves the right to publication.

Updated February 2021.

# GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS – CLINICAL FEATURES

The *Journal* commissions clinical features from experts to illustrate techniques or new evidence for the Irish dental profession. These should be highly visual and can include summary tables, photographs, diagrams and/or key learning points. These should not exceed 1,000 words (very visual features may be shorter).

Clinical features should be an aid to improving clinical practice. As opinion pieces they should not be heavily referenced, but may include up to 10 references or further recommended reading, such as a position paper, clinical guideline, advice sheet or systematic review.

Submission format should be aligned with *Journal* style (see requirements for submissions).

The text must be a minimum of 10pt size and double spaced.

Each page must be numbered in consecutive order from the title page, through the text, references, tables and photographs in that order. The *JIDA* cover page must contain the title and all the authors' names and affiliations. Dentists registered in the Republic of Ireland must not use any qualifications not registered by them with the Dental Council. This page must also give the name, address, phone number and email of the corresponding author, who will undertake correspondence, proofreading, etc.

Include a high-quality jpeg of the lead author.

References must be identified in the text by superscript and numbered consecutively in order of appearance in the text.

References shall be given according to the Vancouver style.

For example:

Peres, M.A., Macpherson, L.M., Weyant, R.J., Daly, B., Venturelli, R., Mathur, M.R., et al. Oral diseases: a global public health challenge. *The Lancet* 2019; 394 (10194): 249-260.

Recommended reading or additional resources can be included at the end.

Tables, figures and images

■ All tables must be on separate sheets and must have a consecutive number and a clear, concise title. Do not duplicate data in tables and text. Include adequate information (using footnotes if necessary) to make the table self-explanatory.



■ Pictures and radiographs should be high-quality jpeg or pdf files, approximately 300dpi and a minimum of 500kbs for publication purposes. They should not be embedded in the text.

■ Figures must be identified with a number in order of their mention in the text.

All acknowledgements should be concise and include only identification of grant sources and permission to reproduce from previous publications.

These features are not externally peer reviewed, but the Honorary Editor and relevant Editorial Board members can support the authors in finalising and finishing the content in *Journal* style. They also ensure that the content is of the standard required for publication. Our publishers can provide support in subediting and with the design elements of the feature, such as layout, tables, diagrams, production and any photography.

To facilitate this, authors should submit their feature at least three weeks before the editorial deadline for that issue.

Updated February 2021.

# RESEARCH DATA POLICY FOR THE JOURNAL OF THE IRISH DENTAL ASSOCIATION

The *Journal* encourages authors, where possible and applicable, to deposit data that support the findings of their research in a public repository.

General repositories - for all types of research data - such as figshare and Dryad may also be used.

Datasets that are assigned digital object identifiers (DOIs) by a data repository may be cited in the reference list. Data citations should include the minimum information recommended by DataCite: authors, title, publisher (repository name), identifier DataCite.

## Independent support service on research data

Springer Nature provides an independent research data policy support service for authors and editors, which can be contacted at [researchdata@springernature.com](mailto:researchdata@springernature.com).

This service provides advice on research data policy compliance and on finding research data repositories. It is independent of journal, book and conference proceedings editorial offices and does not advise on specific manuscripts.

This policy is based on [Research Data Policy Type 1](#) by Springer Nature. It is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#).

# ADVERTISING POLICY

1. All advertisements and commercially sponsored publications are independent from editorial decisions. The publisher Think Media Ltd does not endorse any product or service marked as an advertisement or promoted by a sponsor in Think Media Ltd publications. Editorial content is not compromised by commercial or financial interests, or by any specific arrangements with

advertising clients or sponsors.

2. Think Media Ltd reserves the right to decline any type of advertising that is damaging to the brand of Think Media Ltd or is inappropriate to the content held on the Think Media Ltd network.
3. Think Media Ltd will not accept advertising for products or services known to be harmful to health.
4. Advertisements may not be deceptive or misleading, and must be verifiable. Advertisements should clearly identify the advertiser and the product or service being offered. Exaggerated or extravagantly worded copy will not be allowed. Advertisements will not be accepted if they appear to be indecent or offensive in either text or artwork, or if they relate to content of a personal, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, or religious nature.
5. Once an advertisement has been deployed online, it will be withdrawn from the journal site at any time if the Honorary or Managing Editor(s) or Publisher or Editorial Board request its removal.
6. All advertisements for drug-specific campaigns must comply with the relevant European and Irish legislation that regulates advertising. Information about the latest legislation, as well as good practice guidelines, can be found on the Health Products Regulatory Authority in Ireland website, [www.hpra.ie](http://www.hpra.ie).
7. All advertisements for drug-specific campaigns should encourage correct and rational use and must not be misleading.
8. Advertisements and editorial content must be clearly distinguishable, and sponsored supplements must be clearly indicated as such.
9. Editorial decisions will not be influenced by current or potential sponsors and advertisers, and will not be influenced by marketing decisions. Advertisers and sponsors have no control or influence over the results of searches a user may conduct on the website by keyword or search topic.
10. If any advert is requested outside of Think Media Ltd standard advertising positions or practices, then a request will be made to the Editorial Board, who will respond with a full and final decision as soon as possible.
11. Complaints concerning advertisements can be directed in the first instance to the publishers, Think Media Ltd. If the complainant is not satisfied, the complaint can be escalated to the Editorial Board whose decision shall be final, notwithstanding the legal rights of all parties.
12. We do not currently collect information when you visit our website using cookies or web beacons.

## Advertising complaints policy

Please send any complaints about advertising to [paul@thinkmedia.ie](mailto:paul@thinkmedia.ie).

## Advertising Standards Authority for Ireland (ASAI)

The Advertising Standards Authority for Ireland (ASAI) investigates complaints about published medicines advertisements and ensures compliance with ASAI Code Section 11, which is on health and beauty advertising.

Policy correct as of 10/2/21

# THINK MEDIA PROTOCOL FOR HANDLING RETRACTIONS, WITHDRAWALS, AND EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN

## RETRACTIONS

### Circumstances under which Think Media will retract an article

The publisher Think Media Ltd is committed to playing its part in maintaining the integrity of the scholarly record, therefore on occasion, it is necessary to retract articles. Articles may be retracted if:

- There is a major scientific error which would invalidate the conclusions of the article, for example where there is clear evidence that findings are unreliable, either as a result of misconduct (e.g., data fabrication) or honest error (e.g., miscalculation or experimental error).
- Where the findings have previously been published elsewhere without proper cross-referencing, permission or justification (i.e., cases of redundant publication).
- Where there are ethical issues such as plagiarism (appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit including those obtained through confidential review of others' manuscripts) or inappropriate authorship (e.g., "guest" authorship).
- Where unethical research has been reported.

### Think Media's retraction process

In order to ensure that retractions are handled according to industry best practice, Think Media adopts the following retraction process:

1. An article requiring potential retraction is brought to the attention of the journal editor.
2. The journal editor should follow the step-by-step guidelines according to the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) flowcharts (including evaluating a response from the author of the article in question).
3. Before any action is taken, the editor's findings will be sent to the relevant editorial board for review. The purpose of this step is to ensure a consistent approach in accordance with industry best practice.
4. The final decision as to whether to retract is then communicated to the author and, if necessary, any other relevant bodies, such as the author's institution on occasion.

5. The retraction statement is then posted online and published in the next available issue of the journal.

### Complaints procedure

To challenge to a retraction or a related issue, the Think Media procedure is as follows:

1. The complaint may be submitted via the journal editor or directly to Think Media at [ann-marie@thinkmedia.ie](mailto:ann-marie@thinkmedia.ie).
2. An independent investigation is then carried out by at least two representatives nominated by the professional body of the relevant publication.
3. The investigation involves reviewing all correspondence relating to the case in question and, if necessary, obtaining further written responses to queries from the parties involved.
4. The purpose of the investigation is to establish that correct procedures have been followed, that decisions have been reached based on academic criteria, that personal prejudice or bias of some kind has not influenced the outcome, and that appropriate sanctions have been applied where relevant.
5. The investigatory panel will then submit its findings to the relevant professional body for further review before any onward communications to the appropriate parties.
6. Complainants may choose to take their complaint to the board of directors of the relevant professional body.

### Process for issuing a retraction statement

Issuing a retraction statement will mean the following:

1. The retraction will appear on a numbered page in a prominent section of the relevant journal.
2. The retraction will be listed in the contents page and the title of the original article will be included in its heading.
3. The text of the retraction should explain why the article is being retracted.
4. The statement of retraction and the original article must be clearly linked in the electronic database so that the retraction will always be apparent to anyone who comes across the original article.

### Circumstances under which an article may be deleted

It is Think Media Ltd's policy to strongly discourage withdrawal of the version of record in line with the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers' guidelines on retractions and preservation of the objective record of science. Therefore deletion of the version of record is rare and Think Media will only consider it in the following limited circumstances:

- where there has been a violation of the privacy of a research subject;
- where there are errors to which a member of the general public might be exposed and if followed or adopted, would pose a significant risk to health; or,
- where a clearly defamatory comment has been made about others in the relevant field or about their work.

Even in the above circumstances, bibliographic information about the deleted article should be retained for the scientific record, and an explanation given, however brief, about the circumstances of its removal.

### WITHDRAWALS

#### Circumstances under which an article may be withdrawn

##### Accepted articles

An accepted article is the uncorrected, unedited, non-typeset version of an article published on Think Media Ltd's publications' websites. An accepted article will not yet have been formally published and does not yet carry complete bibliographic information. Therefore, where an accepted article is to be retracted because, for example, it contains errors, has been accidentally submitted twice or infringes a professional ethical code of some type, it may be deleted and replaced with a withdrawal statement.

Even in the above circumstances, bibliographic information about the deleted article should be retained for the scientific record, and an explanation given, however brief, about the circumstances of its removal.

##### Version of record

It is Think Media Ltd's policy to strongly discourage withdrawal of the version of record in line with the International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers' guidelines on retractions and preservation of the objective record of science. Therefore, deletion of the version of record is rare, and Think Media Ltd will only consider it in limited circumstances, such as the following:

- where there has been a violation of the privacy of a research subject;
- where there are errors to which a member of the general public might be exposed and if followed or adopted, would pose a significant risk to health; or,
- where a clearly defamatory comment has been made about others in the relevant field or about their work.

### EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN

Journal editors may consider issuing an expression of concern if they have well-founded concerns and feel that readers should be made aware of potentially misleading information contained in an article. However, expressions of concern should only be issued if an investigation into the problems relating to the article has proved inconclusive, and if there remain strong indicators that the concerns are valid.


On very rare occasions, an expression of concern may be issued while an investigation is underway but a judgement will not be available for a considerable time. However, in such cases there must be well-founded grounds to suggest that the concerns are valid.


In all cases, editors should be aware that an expression of concern carries the same risks to a researcher's reputation as a retraction, and it is often preferable to wait to publish a retraction until a definitive judgement has been achieved by an independent investigation.





Irish Dental Association  
Unit 2, Leopardstown Office Park  
Sandyford, Dublin 18.

 +353 1 295 0072

 [info@irishdentalassoc.ie](mailto:info@irishdentalassoc.ie)

 [www.dentist.ie](http://www.dentist.ie)