


Palestrantes




Presidente do Congresso - Gustavo Giordani




 Nazariy Mykhaylyuk



 Florin Cofar



 Eric Van Dooren



 Irene Méndez-Manjón



Carlos Alexandre Câmara



Daniel Machado



Ertty Silva



Fabiano Marson



Felipe Villa Verde



Luis Calicchio



Marcelo Calamita



Marcelo Giordani



Marcelo Kyrillos



Marcelo Moreira



Marcos Pitta



Paulo Vinicius Soares



Ronaldo Hirata



Sidney Kina



Thiago Ottoboni



Victor Clavijo

The importance of systematic reviews for clinical practice in Endodontics

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14436/2358-2545.9.3.012-013.edt>

The clinic based on scientific evidences has never been so mentioned as it is nowadays. Frequently, we testify circumstances in which professionals assume this sort of stance in conferences, courses, classes or even in social media. The platforms, categorized by the number of “followers” and traded “likes”, are dangerously used as means of teaching and learning, as well as sources of conduct establishment. This understanding, however, goes beyond the pertinent speech under the pretext of appreciating or supporting fragile practical concepts. Do we really know what it means to aspire clinical activities in scientific evidence?

The Systematic Reviews is considered a foundation of this new clinical practice model, thereby becoming one of the most valuable resources to establish current scientific knowledge in particular areas of interest. The main objective of Systematic Review is responding to a specific clinical question, grounding in all existent scientific literature, and excluding the biases of the researcher, of the method or of the publication.^{1,2}

Despite the coadjuvant collaboration in the process of scientific evolution, “non-systematic” revisions (known as literature revisions) are based only in a partial search of literature and usually reflect the author’s personal opinion. A qualified Systematic Review presents a rigorous and impartial analysis of all the scientific literature available for a particular topic, as well as the evaluation of this information and the transcription for clinical applicability. In this sense, punctual and grounded answers are sought for the clinic, for protocols stamped by class associations or even for public policies. It has become the best evidence for clinical applicability amongst all scientific literature, specially when liable to statistical resources, namely, the Meta-analysis.^{1,3}

Nonetheless, one of the great issues faced on current scientific publications refers to the quality of the information presented,⁴ which is also applicable to Systematic Review and Meta-analyses. Many international groups have been dedicating themselves to the improvement of published Systematic Reviews, adopting guides for planning and execution, and applying quality evaluation tools in the included studies.⁵⁻⁷ In this scenario, the Cochrane Collaboration and the Joanna Briggs Institute stand out due to their directioned search for excellency in this research method and to information diffusion.