

## The clinician and the scientific evidence

*No, our science is no illusion. But an illusion it would be to suppose that what science cannot give us we can get elsewhere (Sigmund Freud).*

It is noticed a detachment between the shape of published researches and the language used among clinicians. It is no wonder clinicians prefer case reports instead of papers plenty of methodologies and awkward terminologies. The language and imagery of clinical cases are rooted in the daily practice and have the aura of objectivity, for this reason they are assimilated. On the other hand the scientific rigor is blurred by the methodology, what makes it boring. “Narcissus finds ugly what isn’t his mirror”, says a Brazilian composition.

The Science demands the systematization of methods to which clinicians are not bonded or used to. Nevertheless, many even were not introduced to these methods and neither had any contact with the design of scientific studies during undergraduate, this way it becomes an uneasy, thorny and limping script. Without a basis change only a few will get interest on the evidence-based dental practice while on the top of their professional career. The university is the cradle of the graduation and it has little by little bowed to the necessity of reducing such a distance. For us the right path is to correct this asymmetry and to bring undergraduates closer to the research. It is believed that only this way the future professionals will be able to understand the reasons for giving even more attention for a systematic review than to a clinical case. The issue is how to establish its importance if one does not even know what is a systematic review and its *modus operandi*?

Recently Prof. Flores-Mir — head of Department of Orthodontics of the University of Alberta, in Canada and also recently interviewed in this Journal<sup>1</sup> — has told that his students since the beginning of the graduation start learning step by step the construction of a systematic review. This publication method is extremely interesting and important for the process of continuous education of clinicians. But, how is it possible to read if we don’t understand the process for constructing an article?

How to appreciate if when we start reading, the text looks written is Javanese and conjugated in the harder verbal tense, and the methods also look more important than the results? I’m convinced that we need to change the format of scientific publications. This disruption aims at giving lower value to the method, pushing it to the end of the manuscript.

Even in science, changes occur slowly and have to be peer reviewed, that’s why they retard to change. However I can see in the Brazilian orthodontics interesting attitudes aiming at the question core. I have been invited to explain in courses of continuing education about the process of formation of the scientific knowledge and the reason of greater trust in some kind of studies and researches. The main objective of these meetings is to provide clinicians the magnificent information that will bring them bigger chance of success in the next clinical case. In May next there will be an event promoted by the ‘Associação Paranaense de Ortodontia’ (Orthodontic Association of Paraná State, Brazil) focusing to orientate clinicians concerning the importance of scientific evidence for daily practice: A commendable challenge headed by Prof. Alexandre Moro. Also Dental Press in its course of excellence in orthodontics has been doing similar process. It is worth of taking a look.

As participant of the process of developing Brazilian orthodontic science, in combination with the need of bring clinicians a better understanding of the development of scientific research, the Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics will initiate in the second half of 2013 a selection of short papers dealing with the many face of orthodontic science applied to the clinic. This section will be coordinated by the associate-editor Prof. Dr. Fernanda Angeli. Various researches will be invited to try to make narrower the language between the scientific orthodontics and the orthodontic clinic. The idea is to render the scientific methodology to something more pleasing, trying to raise the logic of the Austrian philosopher Wittgenstein, breaking the glass shards over the walls of language to break through the frontiers of the universe.

David Normando  
editor-in-chief (davidnormando@hotmail.com)

1. Flores-Mir C. Interview. Dental Press J Orthod. 2012 Nov-Dec;17(6):13-9.

### Special thematic edition “Orthodontic treatment in adult patients”

Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics (DPJO) is glad to announce the special edition with the theme “Orthodontic treatment in adult patients”. Authors are invited to submit original unpublished articles related to this theme, following the publishing instructions in the

end of the journal. The deadline for submitting articles is May 5th, 2013. All manuscripts will be analyzed through the peer-review system and the accepted ones will be published in the anniversary edition of Sept-Oct, 2013 of the DPJO.