

# **JOURNAL OF ORAL IMPLANTOLOGY**

## **INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS**

The *Journal of Oral Implantology (JOI)* seeks to bring information of interest to scientists, clinicians, laboratory owners and technicians, manufacturers, and educators. This information includes, but is not limited to, scientific articles, basic and clinical research, research reviews, case letters and research letters, and book and article reviews. None of these necessarily represent the opinions or views of the American Academy of Implant Dentistry (AAID), the Editors or members of the Board, or the Institution with which the author(s) are affiliated. Articles are welcomed from all clinicians and scientists. Membership in the AAID is not a prerequisite for submission. This journal does not necessarily offer approval of products advertised within it.

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Manuscript Submission .....  | 3 |
| General Publication Policies.....                                      | 3 |
| Manuscript Types.....  | 3 |
| Editorials.....  | 3 |
| Clinical Research Papers & Dental Implant Science Research Papers..... | 3 |
| Clinical Case Letters & Research Letters.....                          | 3 |
| Review Papers.....   | 4 |
| Mini-Review Papers.....  | 4 |
| Letters to the Editor.....   | 5 |
| Book/Article Review.....   | 5 |
| Manuscript Preparation.....  | 5 |
| General Comments.....  | 5 |
| Headings.....  | 5 |
| Quantitative Analysis.....   | 6 |
| Abbreviations, Symbols, and Nomenclature.....                          | 6 |
| Drugs.....   | 6 |
| Gender Reference.....  | 6 |
| Tooth Numbers.....   | 6 |
| Manuscript Files to Include in Submission.....                         | 6 |
| Cover Letter.....  | 6 |
| Title Page.....  | 7 |
| Manuscript.....  | 7 |
| Abstract & Key Words.....  | 7 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Body Text.....  | 7  |
| References.....   | 8  |
| Tables.....   | 9  |
| Captions to Figures.....  | 9  |
| Figures.....  | 9  |
| Rebuttal Letter/Response to Reviewers.....                      | 9  |
| Reprints.....   | 9  |
| Review of Your Paper.....                                       | 9  |
| Manuscript Submission Instructions.....                         | 11 |
| Registration & Login.....                                       | 11 |
| Main Menu.....  | 11 |
| Submitting a Manuscript.....                                    | 11 |
| Article Type.....   | 11 |
| Title.....  | 11 |
| Authors.....  | 11 |
| Abstract.....   | 12 |
| Key Words.....  | 12 |
| Classifications.....  | 12 |
| Additional Information.....                                     | 12 |
| Comments.....   | 12 |
| Suggest Reviewers.....  | 12 |
| Attach Files.....   | 13 |
| Approve Submissions.....  | 13 |
| Submitting Revisions for Major or Minor Revision Decisions..... | 13 |
| Check Status & Revisions.....                                   | 14 |
| Appendix.....   | 15 |

## MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION

See below section entitled **MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS** for how to submit manuscripts through the online peer review system. Submitted articles should be for exclusive publication in the *JOI*, with the understanding that they have not been published elsewhere in any form and will not be submitted elsewhere unless rejected. Authors should always retain a complete copy of their manuscripts.

### General Publication Policies (applies to all manuscript types)

Manuscripts will be considered for publication only if they

- are focused;
- are based on a sound hypothesis and an adequate investigation method analyzing a statistically relevant series, leading to relevant results that back the conclusion;
- are well written in simple, scientific English grammar and style;
- are presented with a clear message and containing new information that is relevant for the readership of the journal;
- add new information to the existing body of knowledge or present new points of view on known treatments, pathologies, or implant related issues; and
- have contributions by all authors on the paper.

### Manuscript Types

#### **Editorials**

To be commissioned by the Editor-in-Chief.

#### **Clinical Research Papers & Dental Implant Science Research Papers**

Clinical and Dental Implant Science Research papers should be formatted as follows:

- Title page
- Abstract
- Key Words
- Text
  - Introduction
  - Methods
    - Subjects (human, animal, in vitro)
    - Instrumentation/Measurement
    - Materials
    - Procedures
  - Results
  - Discussion
  - Conclusion
- References
- Tables
- Captions to figures
- Figures: charts, illustrations, photos

**Please see the Appendix to these instructions for a list of criteria that the reviewers will use to evaluate your paper. This list should guide you when writing your paper for review with JOI.**

### **Clinical Case Letters & Research Letters**

Clinical Case Letters and Research Letters are intended to inform, entertain, and inspire the readers. These letters normally contain three parts: 1) Introduction, 2) a description of the case or method and its outcome or result, and 3) discussion. Like all letters, they do not have an abstract. Explanatory and graphic pictures (up to a maximum of 15) are highly recommended in this format.

- **Clinical Case Letters** should present in the introduction a diagnostic conundrum or a practical clinical problem, and introduce the authors' therapeutic logic. The description of the case should contain the history, examination, investigations, management, and outcome of the case. The discussion should educate the reader and open the debate on the many therapeutic options, and the logic of their choices considering the risks and potential outcomes. Clinical Case Letters should enlighten readers about an interesting clinical situation or therapeutic option. They can also serve as the introduction of a new technique, new material or therapeutic approach, or as the first step before a clinical research protocol. Rarity and overspecialization are not necessary, but originality is highly recommended.
- **Research Letters** should present in the introduction an interesting basic science problem or concept to be examined and discussed, followed by a description of methods of investigation and results, and discussion of the data. This format is limited to simple protocols, which do not require a full research article. This kind of article must be particularly reader-friendly and didactic, even if it refers to a dense basic science topic. This format has to be considered as a pedagogic tool for research communication, and not as a format for the publication of large amounts of data. Research Letters can follow the classical 3-part format (introduction, method, discussion) or use a more open format for the purpose of illustrating a concept. The open format can be used as a discussion on a hot research topic or as an introduction to new research perspectives.

### **Review Papers**

Review papers in *JOI* are normally submitted by invitation, but we do consider unsolicited submissions. The purpose of a Review is to bring the reader up-to-date with research in a particular aspect of implant dentistry, highlighting areas of special interest and progress. Because the readership of *JOI* is wide-ranging it is essential that the Review is easily comprehensible to a nonspecialist in the discipline. However, the article should also aim to provide an authoritative in-depth discussion of current progress and problems and should not consist of a laborious report that includes every paper in the area.

The author should not be concerned with providing a comprehensive list of references; references of importance and particular interest are all that are required. The author should identify areas in the field where further developments are impending or of urgent need, and any areas (such as techniques) that may be of consequence to implant dentistry. Please note that Reviews in *JOI* should not contain any original research.

### **Mini-Review Papers**

Mini-reviews are highlights or summaries of research in an evolving area in implant dentistry from the previous 2–3 years. Mini-reviews are not intended to be comprehensive overviews; rather, they are meant to highlight recent and important developments in a specific subject area.

Mini-reviews should not include unpublished original research and should set the topic in the context of the relevant literature. A small amount of speculation of possible upcoming developments is appropriate in the Conclusions section of the paper.

### **Letters to the Editor**

*JOI* welcomes Letters to the Editor. To keep the letter timely and relevant the editorial staff will expedite submission of Letters to the Editor. Only letters of the highest quality will be published, and the following guidelines must be adhered to:

- Letters are meant to be focus pieces and, therefore, are limited to no more than **600 words**. One reference should include a reference to the *JOI* article being addressed.
- It is recommended that you limit your letter to one or two important and critical points to which you wish to provide a clear and precise discussion regarding the previously published article.
- One should support all assertions by peer reviewed literature, which should be primary research or large clinical studies rather than a case report.
- Please include any financial disclosures at the end of the letter. This would include any potential conflicts of interest not just related to the specific content of your letter, but also the content of the *JOI* article and other related areas.
- Please recognize that letters that are essentially in agreement with the author's findings and offer no additional insights or provide little new information for publication. Likewise, letters that highlight the writer's own research or are otherwise self-promotional will receive a low publication priority.
- There may be a need for additional editing. Should editing be required, the letter will be sent back to the author for final approval of the edited version.
- It is important to use civil and professional discourse. It is not advisable that one adopts a tone that may be misconstrued to be in any way insulting.
- Letters that are anecdotal are not acceptable for publication. While personal experiences can have great value in patient care, it is generally not strong evidence to be placed in a [Letter to the Editor](#).

### **Book Review**

A review of a book should be no more than **400 words**.

### **Article Review**

A review of a journal article should be no more than **400 words**.

## **Manuscript Preparation**

### **General Comments**

*JOI* style is based on the *AMA Manual of Style*, 10<sup>th</sup> edition. Some specifics are noted below. Papers should be submitted in this style. Failure to do so will result in the paper being immediately returned to the author, and may lead to significant delays in publication. Spelling is that of American usage. Papers should be typed in Times New Roman, 12-point font, with text double-spaced and with a margin of at least 1 in. (3 cm) all round. Using these formatting specifications, the number of printed (published) pages may be estimated using the following equation:

$$\text{No. of manuscript pages} \div 2.5 = \text{No. of printed pages}$$

## Headings

Headings appropriate to the nature of the paper enhance readability. They should be kept to a minimum and may be removed by the Editors. Only two categories of headings should be used: 1st level headings should be typed in all capital letters; 2nd level headings should be typed in lower case with an initial capital letter.

## Quantitative Analysis

If any statistical methods are used, the text should state the test or other analytical method applied, basic descriptive statistics, critical value obtained, degrees of freedom, and significance level (eg, ANOVA,  $F = 2.58$ ;  $df = 4.58$ ;  $P < .001$ ). If a computer data analysis was involved, the software package and manufacturer should be mentioned. Descriptive statistics may be presented in the form of a table or included in the text.

## Abbreviations, Symbols, and Nomenclature

Only standardized or generally accepted terms should be used. Abbreviations must be defined when initially used in the text. For further details concerning abbreviations, see Baron DN, ed. *Units, Symbols, and Abbreviations: A Guide for Biological and Medical Editors and Authors*. London: Royal Society of Medicine, 1988. The minus sign should be -. If a special designation for teeth is used, a note should explain the symbols. Scientific names of organisms should be binomials, the generic name only with a capital, and should be in italicized font. Microorganisms should be named according to *Manual of Clinical Microbiology*. 10th ed. Versalovic J, Carroll KC, Funke G, Jorgensen JH, Landry ML, Warnock DW, eds. Washington DC: American Society of Microbiology; 2011.

## Drugs

Use only generic (nonproprietary) names in the text. Suppliers of drugs used may be named in the Acknowledgments section.

## Gender References

Do not use “he”, “his”, “she”, or “her” when the sex of the person is unknown; use the term “the patient” or “patient” etc. Avoid alternatives such as “he/she”. Patients should not be automatically designated as “she”, and doctors as “he”.

## Tooth Numbers

When authors wish to list tooth numbers, edentulous sites, or implant locations, *JOI* requires the use of the ADA’s Current Dental Terminology, 2011-2012. This system assigns #1 to the maxillary right 3rd molar and moves around the upper arch to #16, the maxillary left 3rd molar, then continues with the mandibular left 3rd molar as #17, and ends with the lower right 3rd molar as #32. See <http://www.ada.org> for more information.

## Manuscript Files to Include in Submission

### Cover Letter

The cover letter should contain the following information in the form of a letter addressed to the Editor-in-Chief:

- Why the paper is being submitted
- What each of the authors contributed to the paper
- The complete contact information for the corresponding author

## Title Page

JOI conducts double-blind reviews of all submitted articles. Each submission should include a document, separate from the manuscript, that contains the following information:

- Full article title
- Short title
- All author names (in the exact same order as the names are entered into the submission form in the peer review system)
- Earned degrees (PhD, DDS, etc) for all authors
- All authors' affiliations
- Complete contact information for the corresponding author (address, telephone/fax numbers, e-mail address)
- Acknowledgments
- Conflict of interest statement

Please note that the qualifications and professional titles of the authors will not be included in the published paper. The name of the institution where the research was performed also will not be included in the published paper.

## Manuscript

Assemble the manuscript in the following order, with each item beginning a new page. Please turn on line numbering in the Word file.

- **Abstract & Key Words (not applicable for Case Letters and Research Letters)**
  - 250 words or fewer
  - Do not use subheadings or abbreviations
  - Should be one continuous paragraph
  - Must contain all relevant information, including results and conclusion
  - Should contain 6 or fewer key words
- **Body Text.** Please ensure that the body text of your paper conforms to the following structure: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.
  - *Introduction*
    - Present the type and extent of the problem studied.
    - Review briefly the relevant literature.
    - State the rationale for the study.
    - Explain the purpose in writing the paper.
    - State the method of investigation and the reasons for the choice of a particular method.
    - Write in the present tense.
  - *Materials and Methods*
    - Give the full details but limit references.
    - Write in the past tense.
    - Include exact technical specifications, quantities, and generic names.
    - Limit the number of subheadings, and use the same subheadings in the results section.
    - State the statistical analysis used.
    - Indicate that the methodology was reviewed by an independent statistician (for Clinical Research and Dental Implant Science Research papers only)

- Do not mention the investigators' qualifications or the institution where the work was performed.
  - *Results*
    - Do not describe methods.
    - Present results in the past tense.
    - Present representative data rather than endlessly repetitive data.
    - Use tables where appropriate, and do not repeat information that can be found in the text.
  - *Discussion*
    - Discuss—do not reiterate—the data found in the results section.
    - Point out exceptions and lack of correlations in the data. Do not try to disguise or “spin” data.
    - Show how results concur and/or contrast with previous work.
    - Discuss the implications of the study's findings.
  - *Conclusion*
    - State your conclusions clearly.
    - Conclusion must be supported by and limited to the results of the study.
  - *Abbreviations*
    - Include a list of all abbreviations used in the paper with definitions for each abbreviation.
- **References.** Do not use endnotes; instead, type in all references as text. References strictly follow *AMA Manual of Style*, 10<sup>th</sup> edition. In-text citations to references should be indicated using superscripted numbers in numerical order. The references should then be listed at the end of the article in the order they are mentioned in the text. Unpublished observations, personal communications, submitted papers not yet accepted, and abstracts may not appear in the reference section. Refer to written, not oral, communications parenthetically in the text. Also refer to web sites parenthetically in the text. Include among the references papers accepted but not yet published, and label them as “in press.” Sample references are below:
  - *Article from a journal*  
Davaranpanah M, Martinez H, Tecucianu JF, Hage G, Lazzara R. The modified osteotome technique. *Int J Periodontics Restor Dent*. 2001;21:599–607.
  - *Chapter from a book*  
Jensen OT. Guided bone graft augmentation. In: Buser D, Dahlin C, Schenk RK, eds. *Guided Bone Regeneration in Implant Dentistry*. 1st ed. Chicago, Ill: Quintessence Publishing Co Ltd; 1994: 234–264.
  - *Book*  
Misch CE. *Contemporary Implant Dentistry*. St Louis, Mo: Mosby Year Book; 1993.
  - *Paper*  
Ho E, Marcolongo M. The effect of coupling agents on hydroxyapatite/polymethylmetacrylate composite. Paper presented at: Drexel University Research Day, April 22, 2003; Philadelphia, Pa.

- *Web*

Freiberg RJ, Boutosov D, Cozean C. Role of water irrigation during laser ablation of hard dental tissue. Available at: [http://www.laserdentistry.org/praf/edu\\_overview.cfm](http://www.laserdentistry.org/praf/edu_overview.cfm). Accessed February 15, 2004.

- **Tables.** Tables should be numbered consecutively and titled. Use the table function within Microsoft Word to create tables. Table columns should have explanatory headings. Each table should appear on a separate page in the manuscript file following the references. Tables must provide information that cannot be adequately dealt with in the text and should not duplicate (or be a rewording of) information presented in the text. Tables will be formatted and paged in *JOI* style by the Publisher.
- **Captions to figures.** Please supply complete captions for all figures on a separate page at the end of the manuscript. Authors should not use symbols in figure captions; instead, a key should be included as part of the figure. Submit each part of a multi-part figure in separate files. Use letters in the caption for the corresponding figure.

## **Figures**

For electronic figures, the Publisher will accept .eps, .tif, .pdf, and .jpg formats. Images must be at least 4.0 in. (10.2 cm) in width with a resolution of at least 200 dpi. Figure quality may be checked using the complimentary Allen Press VeriFig service available at <http://verifig.allenpress.com/login>. Do not embed figures within the Microsoft Word document containing the manuscript. It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to use figures that have appeared in another publication. Proof of permission to use previously published figures must be presented at the time of submission, and credit to the original source must be given in the figure caption.

## **Rebuttal Letter/Response to Reviewers (for Revised Submissions Only)**

When submitting a revised paper that previously received a Major Revision or Minor Revision decision, please include a letter that provides a response for each point raised by the reviewers. The letter should also describe all the changes made to the paper.

## **Reprints**

Authors will receive a complimentary PDF reprint of their article 3–4 weeks after publication. Paper reprints are available for purchase at the time of publication. The corresponding author will be sent an informational email when it is time to place orders for paper reprints.

## **Review of Your Paper**

Upon passing through the initial quality check, your paper will be assigned to the Editor-in-Chief who will make an initial evaluation of the suitability of the paper for peer review. If the Editor-in-Chief determines that the paper is not suitable for peer review, for any reason, the paper will receive an immediate Editor Rejection.

Should it be determined that the paper can be reviewed, reviewers will be assigned. *JOI* requires two reviews for each paper; however, the Editor-in-Chief may decide to send the paper to additional reviewers if necessary. Once the reviews have been submitted, a decision will be made. Each paper will receive one of the following four decisions:

- **Accept.** Congratulations! Your paper has been accepted for publication and will be published in the next available issue.
- **Major Revision.** For this decision type, the Editor-in-Chief has significant changes that you will need to make before your paper can be reconsidered for publication. In most cases, revisions of papers with Major Revision decisions will be sent to the original reviewers for re-review.
- **Minor Revision.** For this decision type, the Editor-in-Chief has minor changes that you will need to make before your paper will be accepted for publication. In some cases, revisions of papers with Minor Revision decisions will be sent to the original reviewers for re-review.
- **Reject.** A reject decision indicates that the paper is unsuitable for publication in *JOI*.

## MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

### Registration & Login

To register yourself in the peer review system, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/aaid-joi/>. Click on [Register Now](#) and follow the instructions. You will receive an email notifying you of your registration, Login ID, and temporary password. You may be asked to create a new password the first time you login.

### Main Menu

Once you have registered and signed in, you will be directed to the Main Menu. In your Main Menu will see three boxes: [New Submissions](#), [Revisions](#), and [Completed](#). From these boxes you can perform the following tasks:

#### *New Submissions*

- Submit manuscripts
- Check status of submissions

#### *Revisions*

- Submit revised manuscripts
- Check status of revisions

#### *Completed*

- Check for decisions

### Submitting a Manuscript

As a submitting Author, your role in the review process begins when you submit a manuscript. Either click on the link in the email you received when you registered, or navigate to the system URL and login manually, and select [Submit New Manuscript](#) from the “New Submissions” box. This will take you to your [New Submission](#) page.

### Article Type

Select an article type from the dropdown menu.

Click the “Next” button.

### Title

On the [Enter Title](#) page, a Full Title and a Short Title (being mindful of word limits) in the boxes provided.

Click the “Next” button.

### Authors

On the [Add/Enter/Remove Authors](#) page, you will automatically be listed as the corresponding author. You may add more author names by clicking the “+Add Another Author” button (please note that a first and last name, academic degrees, and an email address are required for each author).

If you wish to reorder the list of author names, click and hold the vertical blue bar to the left of the name. You may then drag the author name to a different position in the list.

Click the “Next” button.

### **Abstract**

On the [Submit Abstract](#) you can either type or copy and paste the abstract (be mindful of word limit) of your manuscript. Please note that even though Clinical Case Letters and Research Letters are not published with an abstract, the system requires that an abstract is submitted. It is only necessary to type the following into the box: “An abstract is not required.”

Click the “Next” button.

### **Key Words**

On the [Enter Keywords](#) page, enter the keywords, separated by semicolons. Please note that Clinical Case Letters and Research Letters are not published with key words.

Click the “Next” button.

### **Classifications**

Classifications are used to aid in the selection of reviewers with the appropriate specialties for a submission. On the [Select Classifications](#) page, you may choose classifications for your manuscript by clicking “Select Classifications.”

Click the “Next” button.

### **Additional Information**

On the [Additional Information](#) page, there are several questions that must be answered:

- Conflict of interest. Please note that the information entered into this box must also be included in the conflict of interest statement that is included on the title page.
- Dual publication
- Acknowledgment that copyright transfer form has been signed. Please note that only the corresponding author must fill out and sign the copyright transfer form.
- AAID funding acknowledgment
- Open access
- Page charges

Click the “Next” button.

### **Comments**

On the [Enter Comments](#) page, enter any comments you wish to make to the editorial office regarding your submission. Comments entered on this page will NOT appear in your manuscript or be shown to reviewers.

Click the “Next” button.

### **Suggest Reviewers**

On the [Suggest Reviewers](#) page, you may enter the names and contact information for potential reviewers. Fill out the information and click “Add Reviewer” at the bottom of the page. Please note that suggesting reviewer is not required.

Click the “Next” button.

## Attach Files

You are now ready to attach the files for your manuscript. Select the file type of each attachment from the drop-down menu at the top of the screen. Your options are

- Title Page
- Article File
- Appendices
- Copyright Form
- Cover Letter
- Figure
- Supplemental Material
- Table

Type a name for each file in the “Description” window (default will be the item selected). You may either drag the file over to the submission form and drop it, or use the “Browse” button to locate and select the file. You may change the order of the files before you proceed by numbering them sequentially and clicking on “Update File Order.”

Once you have added all your files and placed them in the correct order, click “Next” to build your PDF. Make sure all of your files are accounted for in the table and click the “Build PDF for my Approval” button.

Please note that you are not yet finished with the submission process.

## Approve Submission

After you click the “Build PDF for my Approval” button, you will be taken to a page with instructions regarding approval of the PDF of your submission.

Click on the [Submissions Waiting for Author’s Approval](#) link.

You will be taken to the [Submissions Waiting for Approval by Author](#) page. Until [Action Links](#) appears you cannot check and approve your submission. If the Action column is blank, please wait until [Action Links](#) appears. This may take several minutes depending on the size of the files you uploaded.

You may view, edit, approve and/or remove your submission using the [Action Links](#) drop-down menu. You must first view the submission. Click the [View Submission](#) link to download your PDF file, view it for accuracy, and ensure it appears as intended.

If you wish to make changes, click the [Edit Submission](#) to return to the New Submission screen. Click the tab on the left side of the screen that corresponds to the portion of your submission that you want to edit.

When you are ready to approve the submission, click the [Approve Submission](#) link.

## Submitting Revisions for Major or Minor Revision Decisions

The decision letter you receive from the Editor-in-Chief will indicate whether your manuscript needs revisions before further consideration for publication. Either minor or major revisions will need to be made and the manuscript resubmitted to start the review process over.

Access the manuscript to make revisions either by using the link in the email or clicking [Submissions Needing Revision](#) in the “Revisions” box on your Main Menu.

Select [Revise Submission](#) from the [Action Links](#). This will bring up a confirmation window. Click “OK” if you are ready to proceed. You will be directed to a [Revised Submission](#) screen where you will resubmit your manuscript with revisions. Tracking information and identification (such as the manuscript number) will be carried over from the initial submission.

During the process you will be required to upload a file containing your response to the reviewers’ comments. In addition, the new manuscript file should have the track changes function in Word activated when the text is revised so that any changes made are readily visible to the Editorial Staff and Reviewers.

Original files can be included or excluded by using the check boxes at the bottom of the screen. New files are added in the same way as in the original submission, on the [Attach Files](#) screen. You may move from your original submission any files that are still applicable in your revision (eg, any figure files that were not changed when you revised your paper).

The process for building and approving the PDF is the same for revision submissions as it is for original submissions.

### **Check Status & Revisions**

Once you have submitted your manuscript with revisions, it will appear in the [Revisions](#) box on your Main Menu. Click the [Revisions Being Processed](#) link to view the current status of the revision.

## APPENDIX

### Reviewer Form Clinical Research Papers and Dental Implant Science Research Papers

Positive declarative statements are used by the reviewer to rate the submitted manuscript. The reviewer rates each statement using a scale from 1 to 4, as follows:

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Agree

4 = Strongly Agree

NA/NC = Not Applicable or No Comment by the reviewer.

#### I. Title and Abstract

- A. Title clearly identified target(s) population and variables under study.
- B. Abstract was well written and clearly described the purpose, methods {subjects, instrument(s), design, procedures}, important findings, implications, theoretical support, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

#### II. Introduction

- A. A clear statement of the problem was provided.
- B. The rationale for the study was very logical and convincing.
- C. A review of literature was current, thorough, accurate, and clearly related to the statement of the problem.
- D. Terms were clearly defined.
- E. The specific purpose of the study, research questions, or hypotheses was a logical extension of the problem, rationale, and literature review.
- F. Theoretical foundation for the study was provided and supported.
- G. A clearly written research question(s) was provided.
- H. The introduction was well organized and well written.

#### III. Methods

- A. Methodology was reviewed by an independent statistician.
- B. Human or Animal Selection and Protections
  - 1. Protection of humans or animals was clearly described and complied with national and international protection guidelines.
  - 2. Human or animal selection and exclusion criteria were clearly described.
  - 3. Random selection of humans or animals and random assignment to groups was clearly described.
  - 4. Differential selection of humans or animals and threats to internal validity were clearly controlled.
  - 5. Humans or animals were not selected on basis of extreme scores.
  - 6. Interaction of human or animal selection and threats to external validity were clearly controlled.
  - 7. The selection and protection text was well organized and well written.
- C. Instrumentation/Measurement
  - 1. The instrumentation was appropriate.
  - 2. The instruments were calibrated for the population sampled.
  - 3. The instrumentation measurements were reliable and valid.

- 4. Experimenter bias was controlled.
- 5. Test environment was controlled.
- 6. Instructions to humans were controlled.
- 7. Adequate selection and measurements of independent variable(s) were described.
- 8. Adequate selection and measurements of dependent variable(s) were described.
- 9. The instrumentation text was well organized and well written.

#### D. Materials

- 1. Materials were clearly described.
- 2. Materials were referenced to connect readers with vendors.
- 3. Materials were well organized and well written.

#### E. Procedures

- 1. The research design was appropriate for the study.
- 2. The procedures controlled threats to internal validity (confidence that independent and dependent variables were experimentally related).
  - a. Extraneous variables in the study were controlled.
  - b. Potential confounding variables were controlled.
  - c. Variable relationships (e.g. convincing antecedence conditions) were controlled.
  - d. Causality was clearly described.
  - e. The procedures controlled threats to external validity were well controlled (e.g. history, maturation, etc.).
- 3. The procedures supported external validity.
  - a. Population validity (research sample like the population being generalized) was controlled.
  - b. Ecological validity (research procedures generalized across settings) was controlled.
  - c. Threats to external validity were controlled (e.g. interaction effects of testing, etc.).
  - d. Procedures were well organized and well written.

#### IV. Results (Quantitative)

- A. Results were reviewed by an independent statistician.
- B. Data organization and tabulation procedures were clear.
- C. A clear and measurable question(s) from the introduction was analyzed.
- D. Informal Analysis were effectively used and presented (e.g. boxplots, scatterplots, etc.) to informally answer the research question(s). Tables and figures from this informal analysis were labeled, used within text, self-explanatory, and efficiently used.
- E. Summary Descriptive Statistics were effectively used, tabled, and integrated into text. Tables and figures from descriptive statistics were labeled, used within text, self-explanatory, and efficiently used.
- F. Formal Statistical Analysis, when used, effectively: controlled for mathematical assumptions and alpha levels, answered the research question(s), and provided a clear summary table(s) and figure(s) of the software output results. Tables and figures from the formal statistical analysis were labeled, used within text, self-explanatory, and efficiently used.
- G. The name and version of the statistical software used was provided in text and cited in references.
- H. The name of the statistical tool(s) used is exactly the same as used by the statistical software publisher, and this name is consistently used throughout the manuscript.

- I. The results were clearly related to research question(s) asked without overgeneralizing the results.
- J. Tables and figures from a formal statistical analysis were: clearly and accurately labeled, were used with text, were self-explanatory, and efficiently communicated useful information related to the research question(s).
- K. Results were well organized and well written.

#### V. Discussion, Summary, and Conclusions

- A. The discussion, summary, and conclusions were clearly related to the research problem and the research question (questions) investigated.
- B. Limitations of the study were clearly discussed.
- C. Conclusions were drawn directly and accurately from results.
- D. Reasonable explanations were given for unusual, atypical, or discrepant results.
- E. The results were clearly related to one or more theoretical explanations.
- F. The results were empirically argued as externally valid to the population from which the sample was taken.
- G. Implications for application of findings were empirically discussed and not overgeneralized beyond the scope of the study.
- H. Suggestions for future research were empirically discussed and limited to the results of the study.
- I. The discussion, summary, and conclusions were limited to the empirical findings of the study, well organized, and well written.

#### VI. References

- A. References (not a bibliography) were cited in text and all text citations were listed in references.
- B. References followed the Journal of Oral Implantology requirements.
- C. References were well organized and well written.

#### VII. The Manuscript

- A. The manuscript was well written and clearly presented.
- B. The manuscript was accurate and efficiently presented as a convincing empirically persuasive argument.

Comments: