



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Journal of Arthroplasty

journal homepage: www.arthroplastyjournal.org

Adult Reconstruction Studies Presented at AAOS and AAHKS 2011–2015 Annual Meetings. Is There a Difference in Future Publication?

Qais Naziri, MD, MBA ^{a,*}, Patrick J. Mixa, MD ^a, Daniel P. Murray, BA ^a,
Preston W. Grieco, MD ^a, Emmanuel M. Illical, MD ^a, Aditya V. Maheshwari, MD ^a,
Harpal S. Khanuja, MD ^b

^a Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York

^b Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 August 2017

Received in revised form

23 October 2017

Accepted 27 November 2017

Available online xxx

Keywords:

abstracts

publications

podium

poster

AAHKS

AAOS

ABSTRACT

Background: The purpose of this study was to compare adult reconstruction abstracts presented at the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) and the American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons (AAHKS) annual meetings.

Methods: A total of 1355 podium and 1731 poster presentations from the adult reconstruction sections of the AAOS and AAHKS meetings from 2011 to 2015 were reviewed for publication in peer-reviewed literature. Authors who were added or removed from the original abstract and the final manuscript were recorded. The corresponding journals were assigned the most recent impact factor. The publication rates for each annual meeting, the mean changes in authorship and journal's impact factors were compared.

Results: There were 2129 abstracts presented at AAOS and 957 abstracts presented at AAHKS. The overall publication rate was different between AAOS and AAHKS (56% vs 60%, $P = .030$). Compared with AAOS, there were more AAHKS abstracts published in 2011 (57% vs 77%, $P = .0008$) and 2012 (57% vs 76%, $P = .0001$); however, there were no significant differences in 2013, 2014, or 2015. The mean overall change in authors was lower for AAOS compared with AAHKS abstracts (0.78 vs 1.06, $P < .0001$). The mean journal's impact factors for AAOS and AAHKS publications were also similar (2.86 vs 2.85, $P = .874$).
Conclusion: AAOS and AAHKS abstracts presented in the adult reconstruction subspecialty had a similar overall rate of publication, change in authorship, and impact factor. It would be beneficial if further studies subdivided these into basic and clinical science and review articles.

© 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

In the specialty of adult reconstruction surgery, the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) and the American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons (AAHKS) annual meetings provide a forum for the most recent research and advancements in clinical practice. The AAOS annual meeting, commonly in February or March, spans a total of 5 days and includes a comprehensive

collection of presentations from all specialties; upward of 400 poster and podium presentations pertaining to adult hip and knee reconstruction. The annual AAHKS meeting, historically held in early November, spans 4 days, and focuses specifically on hip and knee reconstruction with approximately 200 posters and 60 podium presentations.

An increasingly important part of contributing to the practice of evidence-based medicine involves the publication of work in peer-reviewed journals. Over the years, the reported publication rates of studies presented at various national orthopedic meetings have been between 34% and 59% [1–6]. When looking back at previous meetings, Donegan et al [1] found that the overall publication rate from the 2001 AAOS annual meeting was 49%, of which 59% of the adult reconstruction abstracts were published, and Lloyd et al [2]

One or more of the authors of this paper have disclosed potential or pertinent conflicts of interest, which may include receipt of payment, either direct or indirect, institutional support, or association with an entity in the biomedical field which may be perceived to have potential conflict of interest with this work. For full disclosure statements refer to <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2017.11.058>.

* Reprint requests: Qais Naziri, MD, MBA, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, SUNY Downstate Medical Center, 450 Clarkson Ave., Box 30, Brooklyn, NY.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2017.11.058>

0883-5403/© 2017 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

and Yoon et al [6] reported that for the AAHKS annual meetings that occurred from 1996 to 2001, the overall publication rate for abstracts was 54%. Although national meetings have their own peer-review process, the review process required for publication in a journal is often more comprehensive and rigorous. In many cases, abstracts presented at a conference do not pass the scrutiny of a peer review for a journal, and therefore never reach the full potential of their academic impact [3,4,7,8].

Many factors have contributed to the increase in the number of peer-reviewed journals and number of studies published within the field of orthopedics, such as open access journals and industry-funded studies. The increase in the number of studies being published is accompanied with an increase in the number of authors per study. Over the past 60 years, the number of authors contributing to each abstract or publication has risen from an average of 1.6–5.05 [9,10]. As abstracts from conferences become manuscripts for publication, authors may sometimes be added or removed from the manuscript based on several factors including the specific journal's requirements for authorship, coauthors who contributed the most work to the study, and also based on the senior author's discretion.

The purpose of this study was to compare all the studies presented at the AAHKS and AAOS annual meetings from 2011 to 2015 by evaluating their contributions to publication in the specialty of "Adult Reconstruction." For this analysis, we compared the 2011–2015 AAOS and AAHKS annual meetings to answer the following questions: (1) How many abstracts were presented at the two meetings and how many of those got published? (2) Was there a difference in the publication rates between AAHKS and AAOS? (3) Were there changes in authorship from when the studies were presented vs when they were published? (4) For those studies eventually published, was there a difference in the journal's impact factor?

Methods

Study Design

For this comprehensive literature search, the final programs from the 2011–2015 AAOS and AAHKS annual meetings were retrieved. All poster and podium presentations from the AAHKS annual meetings and the adult reconstruction sections of the AAOS annual meetings were included. Papers presented on specialty day were not included. As of October 2016, a total of 1355 podium and 1731 poster presentations were reviewed for subsequent publication as a full-text article in the peer-reviewed literature.

Data Collection and Entry

A computerized search was performed on the Medline, PubMed, and Ovid databases using the key words from the title of the abstract and names of the authors. The design of this search resembled the methods used previously by Bhandari et al [11] and Donegan et al [1]. When a corresponding publication was found, the journal name, publication date, and electronic publication (Epub) date were recorded. If there were any changes in the title, the content of the original abstract was compared with the abstract of the final manuscript to determine consistency in the reported data. The number of authors that were added or removed between the original abstract and the final manuscript were recorded. Published abstracts labeled as orthopedic proceedings, studies on topics other than the hip or knee, or those published before the abstract submission date from the corresponding year were excluded. For each manuscript indexed, the corresponding journal was assigned the most recent impact factor in accordance with

Thomson Reuters Journal Citation Reports (JCR). An additional search of the final programs was performed to access the number of abstracts presented at both annual meetings.

Statistical Analysis

The data collected were grouped by annual meeting, and separated into podium and poster presentations. A database was made using an electronic spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel; Microsoft Office, Redmond, WA). Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS statistical software, version 24 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY). All the data were normally distributed, and all the tests were 2-tailed. The publication rates for each annual meeting were calculated and compared using Fisher exact test. The mean changes in authorship and journal's impact factors were compared using a Student *t* test. A *P* value <.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

Results

Number of Abstracts Presented and Published

From 2011 to 2015, the AAOS annual meeting had a total of 2129 presentations, including 1073 podium and 1056 poster presentations regarding adult reconstruction (Table 1). During this same period, the AAHKS annual meeting had a total of 957 presentations, including 282 podium and 675 poster presentations. Of the abstracts presented at the AAHKS meetings over this period, 35% (338 of 957) were also presented at the AAOS meetings.

Differences in Publication Rates

The overall publication rate for the 5 years was significantly different between AAOS (1192 of 2129) and AAHKS (576 of 957) (56% vs 60%, *P* = .0305). For AAOS, there was a significant difference in the publication rates between the podium (656 of 1073) and poster (536 of 1056) presentations (61% vs 51%, *P* = .0001). There was also a significant difference in the publication rates between AAHKS podium (222 of 282) and poster (354 of 675) presentations (79% vs 52%, *P* = .001). For podiums only, AAHKS had significantly higher publication rate compared with AAOS (79% vs 61%, *P* = .0001). However, both had comparable rates for posters (52% vs 51%, *P* = .5216). There was a significant difference in publication rates between the AAOS and AAHKS meetings in both 2011 and 2012. In 2011, 233 of 407 AAOS abstracts and 64 of 83 AAHKS abstracts were published (57% vs 77%, *P* = .0008) and in 2012, 247 of 434 AAOS abstracts and 106 of 139 AAHKS abstracts were published (57% vs 76%, *P* = .0001). The differences in publication rates between AAOS and AAHKS were not statistically significant in 2013, 2014, or 2015 (Table 2).

Table 1

Publication Rates for the 2011–2015 AAOS and AAHKS Annual Meetings Stratified by Year.

Year	AAOS Published	AAHKS Published	<i>P</i> Value
2011	(233/407) 57%	(64/83) 77%	.0008
2012	(247/434) 57%	(106/139) 76%	.0001
2013	(247/415) 60%	(137/212) 65%	.226
2014	(246/426) 58%	(148/259) 57%	.9365
2015	(219/447) 49%	(121/264) 46%	.4376

AAHKS, American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons; AAOS, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8799443>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8799443>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)