Clinical and experimental research provides us with the basic knowledge to support the procedures that we apply in our daily practice. We are all aware that we should not use techniques that are not yet supported by scientific evidence or use material that has not been sufficiently tested.

Clinical research gives us the information needed to confirm the validity of new clinical procedures and whether a given device or biomaterial is able to render the expected results. However, to obtain information on healing patterns, experimental research is crucial.

When writing an article or conducting a review for a scientific journal, we should assess materials and methods carefully and whether the conclusions are congruent with the results. In research, to evaluate the phenomenon under study, it is very important to select with accuracy the variables and the methods to measure these variables. In addition, to eliminate possible biases that may lead to incorrect measurements and wrong conclusions, particular attention has to be paid to correct use of randomization and calibration procedures. We need to apply these measures to reduce the risk of bias and improve the quality of our research so that our results and interpretations may be relied on. This improved quality will be useful for systematic reviews that are located at the top of the evidence-based medicine pyramid. However, it should be emphasized that systematic reviews would not exist without the daily work of the researchers. As researchers, it is important that we apply proper procedures to reduce the risk of bias and to improve the quality of our methodology and data collection. If we do not ensure this, systematic reviews will rely on few studies, few patients, low homogeneity regarding population, and poor standardization of methods and data, and the conclusions will thus not be clinically relevant.
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