

Double-blind Peer Review: A Crucial Process

Dear Reader,

Research in dentistry is somehow moving towards a self-interest process. As a member of the scientific community whose purpose is to develop and improve clinical dentistry, I feel that some research principles have been increasingly neglected in favor of “publication shopping”, which moves large amounts of money and feeds the ego of many researchers.

The double-blind peer review is common practice by most renowned dental journals; nevertheless, some periodicals openly reveal the authors' names of the paper to be reviewed. The problem with this latter type of review is that it may facilitate manipulation, making an impartial review process impossible.

The race for publication, in search of financial support and personal recognition, fosters competition among researchers worldwide and, in some cases, goes beyond ethical and moral limits. An “open review”, enabling the referees to see the authors' names, might lead to premature rejection of the paper, especially when the researchers involved compete for grants in the same area.

This condition is exacerbated when the ego of the scientist writing the review is so inflated that it interferes with his/her ability to make an unbiased decision, causing him/her to judge the manuscript unsuitable for publication. The ego can lead to an unnecessary rivalry among different researchers and/or institutions, and this competition can negatively influence the judgment of the paper's content.

The different situations listed above can cause a depreciation of some studies, which, due to sequential rejections by well-respected journals, are then submitted to periodicals of lower reputation or fewer impact points, but with an editorial policy that implements a fair and effective review process. Therefore, despite some of its drawbacks, such as the “publication shopping” previously described by Özcan, the double-blind peer review is still the best option for reviewing scientific manuscripts.

I would like to suggest the following editorials to increase awareness and prompt reflection:

Roulet JF. Research for research's sake? *J Adhes Dent* 2009;11:3.

Özcan M. Peer review revisited – a note about publication-shopping scientists. *J Adhes Dent* 2009;11:87.

Sincerely yours,



Adriano Fonseca Lima, DDS, MS, PhD

e-mail: lima.adf@gmail.com

Editor-in-Chief's comment: To uphold the principle of impartiality in science, the Journal of Adhesive Dentistry has always strictly adhered to the blinded review process for all its manuscripts.