Journal of Digital Health and Advanced Biomaterials
e-ISSN 3086-5972 Diamond Open Access journal.jdhab.org

Beyond technological enthusiasm

Preserving evidence in accelerated science

Lisandro Gonçalves, DDS, MSc[1,2]

[1] Journal of Digital Health and Advanced Biomaterials, Maringá, Paraná, Brazil.
[2] LifeDent Esthetic Clinic, Maringá, Paraná, Brazil.

editor@jdhab.org • ORCID 0009-0004-8140-2876

Published 26 May 2026 • pp. 70–72 • DOI 10.67463/ynd16543

ABSTRACT

This closing editorial reflects on the inaugural volume of the *Journal of Digital Health and Advanced Biomaterials* by arguing that technological innovation acquires scientific value only when it remains accountable to evidence. It addresses the methodological risks of accelerated science, the growing importance of traceability and reproducibility, and the responsibility of scientific journals to preserve critical scrutiny in fields shaped by artificial intelligence, robotic systems, digital infrastructures, and advanced biomaterials.

KEYWORDS digital health; advanced biomaterials; editorial responsibility; methodological rigor; accountable innovation; robotic telesurgery

EXPLORE Article text License Online record

Contemporary healthcare research is entering a paradoxical moment. Science has never possessed such extensive capacity to visualize, model, quantify, simulate, automate, and digitally reproduce biological and clinical phenomena. Three-dimensional workflows, artificial intelligence, advanced biomaterials, robotic systems, computational diagnostics, digital twins, and sophisticated interfaces are rapidly reshaping the language of innovation. Yet scientific communication is increasingly exposed to a subtle but consequential imbalance: technical sophistication is not always accompanied by equivalent methodological discipline.

This tension is becoming structural.

The Journal of

In many emerging fields, scientific value is increasingly associated with visual complexity, algorithmic vocabulary, computational power, and novelty. Under these conditions, persuasive presentation may begin to replace interpretive clarity. Reproducibility may be assumed rather than demonstrated. Clinical relevance may be inferred from innovation itself. Sophisticated outputs may coexist with fragile transparency. The result is not necessarily fraudulent science, but something harder to recognize: the appearance of precision without sufficient evidentiary depth.

For scientific publishing, this challenge extends beyond the assessment of isolated manuscripts. It directly affects editorial responsibility. Journals can no longer function merely as channels for accelerated dissemination. In rapidly evolving technological fields, editorial rigor becomes part of the evidentiary structure of science. Methodological coherence, traceability, reproducibility, transparent interpretation, and disciplined reporting are not secondary formalities added after discovery; they are conditions that allow scientific claims to remain examinable, comparable, and clinically meaningful over time. Digital Health and Advanced Biomaterials was established within this context and from this concern. The journal was not conceived simply as a repository for technology-oriented research, but as an editorial space committed to preserving methodological seriousness in disciplines increasingly shaped by automation, digital mediation, computational systems, and material innovation. Scientific advancement depends not only on the capacity to create new technologies, but also on the capacity to critically examine their assumptions, limitations, interpretability, and translational relevance.

This position is intentionally interdisciplinary. Digital health and advanced biomaterials do not evolve through isolated domains of knowledge. Clinical sciences, material sciences, engineering, rehabilitation, imaging, artificial intelligence, data science, and digitally mediated workflows increasingly converge within the same investigational environments. However, interdisciplinarity without conceptual discipline risks producing fragmentation rather than integration. Innovation without evidentiary structure risks producing enthusiasm without durability.

The articles in this inaugural volume reflect this perspective. Together, they illustrate how contemporary health research increasingly operates at the intersection of digital systems, material science, clinical reasoning, and evidence generation. Although they address distinct subjects, including biomaterial behavior and reversibility, digital workflows, individualized devices, clinical documentation, and technology-assisted healthcare, they converge around a common question: how can innovation be transformed into reliable evidence? Across different methodologies and applications, the central challenge remains the same: ensuring that increasingly sophisticated tools remain connected to reproducible methods, interpretable outcomes, and clinically meaningful conclusions.

Recent advances in robotic telesurgery illustrate this transformation particularly well. Procedures performed across continents, separated by thousands of kilometers, show how digital infrastructures increasingly mediate diagnosis, intervention, and clinical decision-making. What recently belonged to technological speculation has entered clinical practice. Yet the scientific relevance of these achievements resides not merely in distance, robotic sophistication, or remote execution. Their legitimacy depends on the ability to document performance, verify safety, establish accountability, preserve traceability, and enable independent scrutiny of outcomes. As healthcare becomes progressively connected, the evidentiary standards supporting innovation become more important, not less.

For this reason, JDHAB places particular emphasis on research capable of connecting technological development to accountable evidence. We are especially interested in work that values transparent methods, measurable outcomes, reproducible workflows, clinically interpretable endpoints, robust validation strategies, and scientifically defensible reasoning. Technological sophistication acquires relevance only when accompanied by analytical clarity and methodological responsibility.

This editorial position should not be interpreted as resistance to innovation. On the contrary, it reflects the conviction that emerging technologies will achieve durable scientific and clinical legitimacy only if they remain anchored to standards capable of supporting independent scrutiny and reproducible interpretation. Scientific progress is not weakened by rigor; it is sustained by it.

As contemporary research becomes increasingly capable of scanning, modeling, engineering, automating, printing, simulating, and algorithmically generating solutions, the responsibility of scientific journals becomes correspondingly greater. The future credibility of digital health and advanced biomaterials will depend not only on what technology makes possible, but on what science continues to make verifiable.

The defining question is no longer whether innovation can occur.

It is whether innovation can remain accountable.

That is the editorial direction this journal intends to cultivate — and the standard against which future innovation should continue to be examined.

License and reuse

CC BY 4.0

© 2026 Lisandro Gonçalves. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Publisher notice on AI, text and data mining

This article is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Any automated harvesting, large-scale text and data mining, or machine-learning reuse of journal content must preserve proper attribution, source integrity, citation metadata, and compliance with applicable legal, ethical, and platform-use requirements.

Article record

Canonical citation
Gonçalves L. Beyond technological enthusiasm: Preserving evidence in accelerated science. J Digit Health Adv Biomater. 2026;1(1):70–72. https://doi.org/10.67463/ynd16543.

Assessment Editorial assessment