

Journal of the American College of Dentists

Ethics Policy for Publication

Purpose. This policy establishes ethical expectations for authors, reviewers, editors, Editorial Board members, and others involved in the submission, review, editing, and publication of content in the Journal.

1. Scope and Applicability

This Publication Ethics Policy applies to all authors, reviewers, editors, Editorial Board members, and others involved in the submission, review, editing, and publication of content in the Journal of the American College of Dentists ("JACD" or "Journal"). The policy applies to all manuscript types, including original research, reviews, case reports, editorials, commentaries, letters, and other submissions considered for publication.

All participants in the publication process are expected to uphold the highest standards of integrity, professionalism, transparency, fairness, and ethical conduct.

2. Authorship and Contributor Status

Accurate Representation

Authors must ensure that submitted work is original, accurately represents the contributions of all authors, and is properly attributed. All individuals who have made substantial scholarly contributions to the research or manuscript should be listed as authors, while those who contributed in a lesser capacity should be acknowledged appropriately. All authors must review and approve the final manuscript prior to submission.

Accountability

Authors are responsible for the integrity, accuracy, and completeness of their work and must provide accurate and complete data. Misrepresentation, falsification, fabrication, or selective reporting of data is prohibited.

Contributor Status

The Journal may require authors to disclose their specific contributions to a manuscript. All listed authors should be able to identify their own contributions and have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

3. Conflict of Interest

Transparency

Authors, reviewers, editors, and Editorial Board members must disclose any financial, professional, institutional, academic, or personal relationships that could reasonably be perceived to influence the outcome, review, publication, or interpretation of their work. These disclosures ensure the credibility and impartiality of the published material.

Management of Conflicts

Individuals with actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest should recuse themselves from decisions or activities where such conflicts could compromise, or appear to compromise, their objectivity or impartiality.

4. Plagiarism and Originality

Commitment to Originality

Authors must ensure that submitted work is original and has not been published elsewhere or simultaneously submitted to another publication unless appropriately disclosed and permitted.

The Journal does not permit plagiarism, duplicate publication, self-plagiarism, inappropriate reuse of previously published material, or misappropriation of another person's ideas, data, images, or intellectual property without proper attribution.

All submissions may be screened using plagiarism-detection software.

Proper Citation

Authors must appropriately acknowledge and cite all sources of information, ideas, data, images, and research upon which their work relies.

5. Research Ethics, Human Participants, and Confidentiality

Ethical Research

Research involving human participants must be conducted in accordance with applicable ethical standards, regulations, and institutional policies. Authors must obtain approval or exemption from an Institutional Review Board (IRB), ethics committee, or equivalent oversight body when required and disclose such approval in the manuscript. Authors must also confirm that informed consent was obtained from participants when applicable.

Privacy and Confidentiality

Authors must protect the privacy and confidentiality of research participants, patients, and other individuals whose information appears in a manuscript.

Identifiable information, including text, photographs, radiographs, videos, or other images, must not be published without appropriate written consent. Where consent is not required, information must be appropriately anonymized or de-identified in accordance with applicable laws and ethical standards.

6. Data Availability, Integrity, and Image Standards

Data Integrity

Authors are responsible for maintaining the accuracy, completeness, and integrity of the data underlying their research. Data should be retained in accordance with institutional and regulatory requirements and made available to editors upon reasonable request, when appropriate and consistent with ethical, legal, and privacy obligations.

Image Integrity

Photographs, clinical images, radiographs, figures, and other visual materials must accurately represent the underlying data and observations.

Images may not be altered in a manner that misrepresents, obscures, enhances, removes, or otherwise distorts scientific findings. Acceptable adjustments for clarity must be applied consistently and must not affect interpretation of the information presented. Material modifications should be disclosed where appropriate.

7. Peer Review Process

Objective Evaluation

Peer review must be conducted in a fair, objective, impartial, and confidential manner. Reviewers are expected to disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest and decline review assignments when such conflicts could reasonably affect or appear to affect their objectivity.

Reviewers should accept assignments only when the manuscript falls within their expertise and they can complete the review within the requested timeframe.

Timely, Constructive, and Confidential Review

Reviewers should provide timely, constructive, respectful, and evidence-based feedback in accordance with the JACD Peer Review Form.

Reviewers must maintain the confidentiality of submitted manuscripts and may not share, discuss, copy, or use unpublished material for personal, professional, academic, or financial advantage.

Reporting Ethical Concerns

Reviewers should promptly notify the Editor if they suspect plagiarism, duplicate publication, data fabrication, image manipulation, reference fabrication, peer-review manipulation, ethical violations, or other forms of research or publication misconduct.

Reviewer Comments

Reviewer comments should focus on the quality, rigor, clarity, and significance of the scholarship and should avoid personal criticism of authors.

Integrity of the Peer Review Process

Fabrication or manipulation of peer review, including false reviewer identities, fraudulent reviewer recommendations, or other attempts to improperly influence editorial decisions, constitutes serious publication misconduct.

8. Allegations of Misconduct, Complaints, and Appeals

Allegations of Misconduct

The Journal will review allegations of research misconduct or publication misconduct in a fair, confidential, and timely manner. Allegations may arise before or after publication and may be raised by authors, reviewers, readers, institutions, editors, or other parties.

The Editor may consult the Editorial Board, institutional officials, legal counsel, ethical advisors, or relevant guidance from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) when appropriate.

Authors will generally be afforded an opportunity to respond to concerns before editorial action is taken unless immediate action is necessary to protect the integrity of the scholarly record.

Complaints and Appeals

Authors and other stakeholders may submit complaints or appeals concerning editorial decisions, peer review, conflicts of interest, authorship disputes, corrections, retractions, or other publication ethics matters.

The Editor may consult the Editorial Board or other appropriate advisors when evaluating a complaint or appeal. A disagreement with an editorial judgment alone does not necessarily constitute grounds for reversal of a decision.

9. Corrections, Expressions of Concern, and Retractions

Addressing Errors

The Journal is committed to maintaining the integrity of the scholarly record and will correct significant errors when discovered.

Editorial Actions

Depending on the nature and severity of the concern, the Journal may:

- Request clarification or additional information
- Require correction or revision
- Reject a manuscript
- Publish a correction or erratum
- Publish an expression of concern
- Retract a publication
- Notify relevant institutions or regulatory authorities when appropriate
- Restrict future submissions when warranted by serious misconduct

Transparency

Corrections, expressions of concern, and retractions will be clearly identified and publicly documented to preserve the integrity of the academic record.

10. Editorial Independence

Impartial Decision-Making

Publication decisions shall be based on the quality, originality, significance, relevance, methodological rigor, and ethical soundness of submissions, without improper influence from individuals, organizations, sponsors, advertisers, professional associations, or other external interests.

Intellectual Freedom

The Journal supports intellectual freedom and scholarly debate, provided that submissions meet standards of scientific integrity, professionalism, and ethical conduct and do not contain defamatory, discriminatory, harassing, or otherwise inappropriate content.

Recusal for Conflicts of Interest

Editors and Editorial Board members must recuse themselves from decisions involving manuscripts in which they have an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest.

11. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

AI-Assisted Content

Artificial intelligence tools, including large language models and generative AI systems, may not be listed as authors because they cannot assume responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, originality, or ethical accountability required of authorship.

Authors must disclose any substantive use of AI-assisted technologies in the preparation of a manuscript. The disclosure should identify the tool used and describe the manner and extent of its use.

Author Responsibility

Authors remain fully responsible for all content in their submissions, including text, data, tables, images, analyses, references, and conclusions, regardless of whether AI-assisted tools were used.

Authors must review and verify all AI-generated or AI-assisted content and ensure that it is accurate, appropriately attributed, free from plagiarism, and consistent with accepted scholarly standards.

Routine Language Editing

Routine use of software for spelling correction, grammar improvement, formatting, or language polishing generally does not require disclosure unless it materially affects scholarly content or interpretation.

Reviewer Use of AI

Reviewers should not upload confidential manuscripts, unpublished data, or proprietary information into publicly accessible AI systems.

Any permitted use of AI tools must not replace the reviewer's independent scholarly judgment or responsibility for the review.

12. References, Guidance, and Interpretation

This Publication Ethics Policy is informed by the Core Practices of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and reflects the Journal's commitment to integrity, ethical scholarship, transparency, fairness, accountability, and professionalism throughout the publication process.

Questions regarding the interpretation or application of this Policy should be directed to the Editor, who may consult the Editorial Board or other appropriate advisors.

Additional Resources

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE): [COPE Core Practices](#)

Zimba O, Gasparyan AY. Peer review guidance: a primer for researchers. *Reumatologia*. 2021;59(1):3-8. doi:10.5114/reum.2021.102709.

Approved by the JACD Editorial Board: August 25, 2026