

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

1. General content and organization

- The abstract is congruent with the paper and based on publication-specific guidelines.
- The title reflects the focus of the paper in a clear and concise manner.
- The introduction provides a clear articulation of the focus of the paper.
- There is a clear rationale to support the focus of the paper and its importance to dental hygiene.
- Concepts important to the article are defined.
- The aim of the study/review/short communication is clearly stated.
- The methods section clearly state how information was gathered (reviews) or data collected (original research).
- Headings guide the reader in moving through the article.
- Each paragraph in the body of the article contributes to the argument presented.
- There is a logical flow throughout the body of the article.
- There is a reasonable balance between evidence and new ideas.
- The argument is built in a coherent manner.
- Tables, figures, and illustrations are presented in a clear and concise format.
- Statements are appropriately supported by citations.
- The conclusion is based upon the evidence presented.
- Resources/references are credible, relevant, and include the most current body of knowledge on the topic.

2. Issues related specifically to research articles

- Study purpose is clearly defined.
- Aims/hypotheses are clearly articulated.
- Ethics approval is clearly stated.
- Study title reflects the study design.
- The study design appears congruent to the question investigated.
- The methods and materials are adequately described.
- The sampling approach is described and appears reasonable given the study design.
- Measures are described in sufficient detail, and include validity and reliability issues for new measures where appropriate.
- Statistical tests are appropriate for the study design and type of data collected.
- Results are presented in a clear and concise manner.
- Tables and figures support the clarity of the findings. Please indicate if the paper would be improved with additional or fewer tables and/or illustrations.
- The discussion section provides a synthesis of the results presented.
- The discussion is robust and includes a comparison of the findings with similar studies published in the literature.
- Limitations of the study are identified.
- Future research directions are suggested.
- The conclusions are supported by the study results.

3. Balance

- Opinions can be clearly distinguished from fact.
- More than one side of an argument is presented or at least acknowledged.
- Enough information is presented so that readers may judge the validity and reliability of the information.

Ethical Guidelines and Reviewer Conduct

Manuscripts under review should be treated as confidential documents both during and after the completion of peer review. The manuscript must not be shown to or discussed with others without prior consent from the Scientific Editor. Research or insights gained from a reading of the manuscript must not be used for personal advantage.

Reviewers must declare any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest prior to accepting the invitation to review.

If you suspect that the manuscript includes text or ideas that have not been properly attributed, you should contact the Scientific Editor immediately and provide as much detail (citations to the original work) as possible.

For research involving human subjects, if you feel that confidentiality has been breached, you should advise the Scientific Editor accordingly.

Reviewers should frame their comments constructively and objectively and should not use language that is inflammatory or demeaning to the author(s). Comments should be sufficiently detailed to allow the authors to improve their work. Provide specific examples of passages that require revision or additional research or analysis where possible.