

## Continuing Evolution of IJOMI

Over the past decade, we have seen changes to how our community engages with clinical science. Traditionally, this has been through formal print research publications. More recently, there has been a shift in how information is distributed to include multiple formats. Some information is distributed through formal journals sponsored by academies, like IJOMI; some through publications in trade journals and other outlets; and some investigators release research studies through social media, blogs, and personal publications.

IJOMI is also undergoing some changes in order to improve the reader experience. Part of these changes are the blending of online and print publications. To start, we are creating a readership survey to evaluate which aspects of the journal experience are considered highly important and which aspects we should perhaps curtail. The journal has had the thematic abstract review section for some time, as well as a recent biostats primer series written to help residents, authors, and reviewers understand key aspects of authorship. The journal is moving from print publishing of 22 to 23 articles per print edition to a shorter 13 to 15 articles, but this is balanced by additional articles that are listed in the table of contents and fully indexed to that edition but are only available in an online format. The latter approach opens opportunities for additional multimedia presentation of data (eg, videos, 3D animations to illustrate approaches and outcomes, video interviews with authors, etc). Again, the online articles are fully indexed and cited on the Quintessence Publishing website and PubMed, among other databases. We are also seeking information on the best way to contemporarily present information to the readership.

It is also probably worth letting readers understand the editorial process that IJOMI uses. The editorial board has recently updated the guidelines and expectations for how papers are to be submitted. This is available on our website under the Downloads tab on the IJOMI page. Following the submission of all required documentation (eg, mandatory submission form and the required protocol checklists), the paper is reviewed in a software called iThenticate to verify that there are no duplicates with papers already in print. Following an acceptable iThenticate score, the Editor-in-Chief and staff review the manuscript, and an initial decision is made on whether to proceed to the full peer review or not (reject before review). If the paper proceeds, the paper is assigned to an associate editor and at least two expert reviewers. In some cases, the paper is also assigned to a biostatistician as a reviewer. At least two

reviews are needed to make a decision (accept, accept with revision, reject but invite resubmission, or reject after review). Lack of response from potential reviewers and delays in the review process can slow down the time it takes to reach a final decision. To counteract this, we have reduced the time to complete reviews and have seen an increase in submissions (about 10 per week). To ensure we treat the author(s) fairly, we do our best to give a response in a reasonable period and allow for a fair peer evaluation of the work. In the end, though, as Warren Berger writes in *The Book of Beautiful Questions* (2018), is the need to question the results—to be skeptical and apply Carl Sagan's baloney questions that are useful for any reader. Our goal in the editorial process is to provide the best information possible, recognizing that every study has limitations. As the old saying goes, if you only had to do the study once, that would be a "search." To do this over and over, looking at different parameters in each protocol, is "research."

Thank you,



Clark M. Stanford DDS, PhD, MHA  
Editor-in-Chief