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A B S T R A C T

Purpose: Bibliometrics is increasingly used to assess the quantity and quality of scientific research output in many research fields worldwide. However, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have documented the main characteristics of arthroplasty publications from different countries. This study aimed to evaluate the worldwide research productivity and status of Turkey in the field of arthroplasty using bibliometric methods and to provide an insight into the arthroplasty research for surgeons and researchers.

Methods: The Web of Science database was searched to identify arthroplasty articles published between 2006 and 2016. The contributions of countries were evaluated based on publication count, citation average, h-index and publication rate in the top 10 ranked journals. Each country's publication output was adjusted according to population size.

Results: A total of 26,167 articles were identified. World arthroplasty publications were increased significantly over time (p < 0.005). The United States was the most productive country with 9007 articles (34.4% of total) followed by England with 2939 articles (11.4% of total) and Germany with 1881 articles (7.1% of total). According to average citations per item, Scotland was in the first place followed by Denmark and Sweden, whereas in the first place according to publication output adjusted by population size was Switzerland followed by Denmark and Scotland. The United States was also in the first place according to h-index and publication rate in the top 10 ranked journals. Founding average was 28.8% (7559 of 26164) for the arthroplasty articles that were analyzed in the study.

Conclusion: There is a rapid increase in the number of articles in arthroplasty research from 2006 to 2016. The United States was the most productive country as measured by total publications in the arthroplasty field. However, some small European countries with high income have higher quality of articles and better productivity when adjusted for population. Gross domestic product (GDP) per capita and research foundation had positive affect on arthroplasty publications, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

© 2018 Turkish Association of Orthopaedics and Traumatology. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

The quality and level of scientific research is a well indicator of a country's developmental status.1 Medical research with human subjects is often expensive and requires sophisticated instrumentation, biochemical measurements, and meticulous follow-up of subjects.2,3 Hence, scientific research has traditionally been dominated by the so-called “G5” countries: The United States of America, The United Kingdom, Japan, Germany and France.4

The word “bibliometrics” has been derived from the Latin and Greek words “biblio” and “metrics” which refer to the application of mathematics to the study of bibliography. Bibliometric analysis is useful in the evaluation of the quality of research in one field. Such studies may help to provide an insight into the dynamics of the field under consideration and this type of analysis provides useful indicators of scientific productivity. It is possible to indicate the quality and productivity in a specific field, in a country or region.
Moreover, it helps the academic society in identifying most productive authors, institutions and locations. The scientific papers promote the knowledge sharing and the advancement of arthroplasty research. However, the quality and quantity of research contributions varies between different countries, due to differences in economies, healthcare systems and medical research status. The number of articles published by a country is an indicator of its contributions to the creation of new knowledge, and bibliometric analysis is often used to investigate trends in scholarly publications and the relative importance of articles in a specific topic. Recently, a number of surveys of publication activity have been conducted to evaluate the contributions of different countries in various fields of medicine. Such articles also have been published in general orthopedics and its subspecialties.

To the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have reviewed global scientific productivity in the field of arthroplasty. The present study aimed to analyze the quantity and quality of worldwide publications, in order to determine the current status of global scientific productivity in the field of arthroplasty along with contribution of Turkey between 2006 and 2016.

Materials and method

36,052 articles were reviewed to analyze research volume and productivity in the field of arthroplasty between 2006 and 2016. Of those, 9,888 articles were excluded for the following reasons; different themes from orthopedic arthroplasty [temporomandibular surgery, spinal disc surgery, veterinary surgery, joint preserving surgery without prosthesis implantation, resection or interposition arthroplasty and osteoarthritis pathogenesis study without surgical intervention (n = 7,334)] and publication type [proceedings paper, meeting abstract, correction, reprint, retracted publication, book chapter, news item, biographical item and book review (n = 2,554)]. Finally, 26,167 articles were included in this study.

Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE) database accessed through Web of Science (WoS) (Thomson Reuters, Philadelphia, PA, USA) was used for this study. The WoS is the world’s leading database for citation and other academic impact information, which makes it widely used in the studies on scientific productivity. A computerized literature search was carried out using the database on December 20th, 2017. We used the following search terms: “Arthroplasty” as topic, “Name of Country” as address, and “2006–2016” as publication year among the English based literature. Top 25 countries were selected based on their publication records according to the literature search. The selected countries were as follows: The United States, England, Germany, Canada, Japan, China, Australia, the Netherlands, South Korea, Italy, Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Denmark, Belgium, Scotland, Turkey, Taiwan, India, Austria, Norway, Finland, Singapore and Greece. Additionally, individual citation reports of the countries were analyzed. Average citations per item, number of publications per million population (PmP), h-index and percentage of funded study per countries were determined. The h-index is an author-level metric that attempts to measure both the productivity and citation impact of the publications of a scientist or scholar. h-index and average citations per item calculation was made by Web of Science database citation report chart. PmP was calculated by dividing the total number of publications by the population of each country. Gross domestic product (GDP) per capita of the countries were listed according to 2016 The World Bank data. Top 10 ranked orthopedic journals that publish arthroplasty articles were determined according to Journal Citation Reports (JCR) 2016 by Thomson-Reuters and countries number of publication in these journals were also listed. These journals were; Journal of Arthroplasty, Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery American Volume, Knee Surgery Sports Traumatology Arthroscopy, Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery British Volume, International Orthopaedics, Acta Orthopaedica (previously Acta Orthopaedica Scandinavica), Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, Journal of Orthopaedic Research and Osteoarthritis and Cartilage. The number of articles from Turkey, the year of publication, the journal which the article was published in, publishing institutions, level of study and type of study were recorded manually. The publishing institutions were determined according to the first author. The articles were divided in two groups regarding two equal time periods (01.01.2006–31.05.2011 and 01.06.2011–31.12.2016) to investigate the increase of quantity and quality of published articles over time.

Statistical analyses were performed by SPSS for Windows 15.0 software (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA). This study included all published articles and not merely a representative sample. Therefore, descriptive analysis was primarily used. Spearman rank correlation and Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to verify normal distribution and the homogeneity of variances of the scales used. To evaluate annual increases in the number of published articles and the correlation with the institutions, the linear regression analysis was performed. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05.

Results

26,167 orthopedic arthroplasty papers were published in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI-E) listed journals between 2006 and 2016. The United States was the most productive country with 9007 articles (34.4%) followed by England with 2939 articles (11.4%) and Germany with 1881 articles (7.1% of). Turkey was ranked 18th with 373 articles (1.4%). According to the publication records in the top 10 ranked journals (n = 9942), the United States was in the first place with 3770 articles (37.9%) and Turkey was 23rd with 86 articles (0.6%). The United States was also in the first place according to h-index with 120 points. According to average citations per item, Scotland was in the first place followed by Denmark and Sweden, whereas in the first place according to PmP was Switzerland followed by Denmark and Scotland. Turkey ranks last by the h-index and the average citations per item and 23rd according to PmP. 28.8% (7539 of 26,164) of arthroplasty articles were funded studies. Denmark was the first ranked country which 50.3% of the studies which were funded. Turkey was the last in the list with 8.8% funded publication. Details are given in Table 1.

PmP index was evaluated for quantitative assessment, average citations per item was evaluated for qualitative assessment of the publications. PmP was strongly correlated with rate of funded publication (γ = .007) and GDP per capita (γ < .001). Average citations per item was also strongly correlated with funded publication rate (γ = .006) and GDP per capita (γ = .002). Also the rate of funded studies in arthroplasty publications was correlated with GDP per capita (γ = .031). In a multiple regression model, both GDP per capita (R = .59, p < .001) and the rate of funded publications (R = .27, p = .007) was independently associated with PmP index. GDP per capita (R = .36, p = .002) and the rate of funded publications (R = .29, p = .006) was also independently associated with average citations per item.

The most productive institution that published the highest number of articles worldwide is Mayo Clinic from the United States with 681 articles between this time periods. Istanbul University is the most productive institution in Turkey with 43 articles. The top 5 institutions that published the highest number of articles in the world and in Turkey are listed in Table 2. The Journal of Arthroplasty published the most arthroplasty articles in this period while Acta Orthopaedica et Traumatologica Turcica published the most
arthroplasty articles originated from Turkey. Top 5 journals which published the most articles are listed in Table 2. With regard to the authors, the author with the greatest number of arthroplasty publications was Javad Parvizi (n = 251) followed by Michael A. Mont (n = 225) and D.W. Murray (n = 146).

The number of the articles on arthroplasty increased from 1486 articles in 2006 to 76 articles in 45 journals in 2016. Thus, there was an increase of 660%, an average of 30.5% per year. The highest growth in the number of articles was recorded in 2011 with 17.8% growth rate and the increase in the number of publications continued throughout this time period. Whereas, the number of articles on arthroplasty published in Turkey increased from 10 articles in 8 institutions in 2011, 25 articles in 26 institutions in 2013 and 57 articles in 47 institutions in 2015. Thus, there was an increase of 570%, an average of 27% per year.

Table 2
The top 25 countries according to the number of arthroplasty publications.

| Countries  | Records  | % of 26167 | Percentage of funded studies (%) | Publication in Top 10 ranked journals (% of total publication of the country) | h-index | Average citations per item | Population | GDP per capita (US $) | Number of publications per million (*10^6) |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| USA       | 9007     | 34.426     | 33.1                             | 3770 (41.9%)                                                             | 120     | 17.56                    | 310,232,863| 57,638               | 5.96                              |
| ENGLAND   | 2939     | 11.233     | 29.8                             | 1029 (35%)                                                               | 87      | 17.5                     | 61,284,806| 40,341               | 4.81                              |
| GERMANY   | 1881     | 7190       | 32.3                             | 726 (36.6%)                                                              | 63      | 17.92                    | 82,282,988| 42,069               | 2.31                              |
| CANADA    | 1515     | 5791       | 39.7                             | 482 (31.8%)                                                              | 74      | 21.48                    | 33,759,742| 41,215               | 4.53                              |
| JAPAN     | 1346     | 5259       | 20.8                             | 537 (39%)                                                               | 42      | 10.58                    | 126,804,433| 38,900               | 11.15                             |
| CHINA     | 1271     | 4851       | 24.5                             | 306 (24.1%)                                                              | 40      | 7.7                      | 1,540,040,000| 8123               | 0.70                              |
| FRANCE    | 1109     | 4239       | 21.4                             | 338 (30.5%)                                                              | 58      | 18.99                    | 40,548,753| 36,855               | 27.73                             |
| AUSTRALIA | 994      | 3799       | 34.0                             | 390 (39.2%)                                                              | 56      | 20.45                    | 21,515,754| 49,927               | 46.26                             |
| NETHERLANDS | 945   | 3612       | 32.2                             | 362 (38.3%)                                                              | 48      | 16.32                    | 16,783,092| 45,699               | 56.06                             |
| SOUTH KOREA | 880   | 3364       | 24.4                             | 469 (53.3%)                                                              | 37      | 10.26                    | 48,636,068| 27,538               | 18.80                             |
| ITALY     | 862      | 3295       | 18.7                             | 264 (30.6%)                                                              | 41      | 13.21                    | 58,090,681| 30,674               | 15.35                             |
| SWITZERLAND | 806   | 3081       | 33.5                             | 292 (36.2%)                                                              | 57      | 17.91                    | 7,997,000 | 79,890               | 101.13                            |
| SWEDEN    | 576      | 2202       | 39.8                             | 314 (54.5%)                                                              | 57      | 24.44                    | 9,074,055 | 51,949               | 63.13                             |
| SPAIN     | 555      | 2121       | 26.3                             | 195 (35.1%)                                                              | 40      | 14.55                    | 40,548,753| 26,639               | 14.06                             |
| DENMARK   | 533      | 2114       | 50.3                             | 231 (41.8%)                                                              | 55      | 24.84                    | 5,515,575 | 53,549               | 100.00                            |
| BELGIUM   | 428      | 1636       | 24.3                             | 146 (34.1%)                                                              | 40      | 16.47                    | 10,423,493| 41,236               | 41.36                             |
| SCOTLAND  | 418      | 1598       | 24.7                             | 171 (40.9%)                                                              | 41      | 26.38                    | 5,228,000 | 34,608               | 80.24                             |
| TURKEY    | 373      | 1426       | 8.8                              | 86 (23.1%)                                                               | 17      | 4.09                     | 75,627,384| 10,862               | 5.00                              |
| TAIWAN    | 369      | 1410       | 30.6                             | 93 (25.2%)                                                               | 29      | 10.44                    | 23,024,956| 22,044               | 16.00                             |
| INDIA     | 350      | 1338       | 14.0                             | 110 (31.4%)                                                              | 24      | 8.53                     | 1,236,686,732| 1709               | 0.39                              |
| AUSTRIA   | 344      | 1315       | 23.3                             | 168 (48.8%)                                                              | 34      | 14.05                    | 8,462,000 | 44,676               | 41.00                             |
| NORWAY    | 300      | 1147       | 32.0                             | 153 (51.1%)                                                              | 40      | 19.85                    | 4,676,305 | 70,911               | 64.00                             |
| FINLAND   | 260      | 994        | 47.3                             | 114 (43.8%)                                                              | 33      | 15.51                    | 5,255,068 | 43,403               | 49.00                             |
| SINGAPORE | 193      | 738        | 20.2                             | 72 (37.3%)                                                               | 20      | 8.2                      | 5,469,724 | 52,962               | 35.00                             |
| GREECE    | 187      | 715        | 11.7                             | 76 (40.6%)                                                               | 24      | 12.77                    | 11,062,508| 17,930               | 17.00                             |

Table 2
The distribution of the articles by institutions, authors, and the journals.

| WORLD | TURKEY |
|-------|--------|
| Institution | Record Count | % of 26167 | Institution | Record Count | % of 373 |
| Mayo Clinic | 681 | 2.603% | Istanbul University (Çapa and Cerrahpaşa Medical Faculties) | 43 | 11.528% |
| Harvard University | 674 | 2.576% | Dokuz Eylül University | 31 | 8.311% |
| University of California System | 569 | 2.175% | Ankara Numune Education and Research Hospital | 25 | 6.702% |
| Hosp Special Surg | 559 | 2.137% | Ankara Atatürk Education and Research Hospital | 20 | 5.362% |
| VA Boston Healthcare System | 492 | 1.880% | Baskent University | 20 | 5.362% |
| Journal of Arthroplasty | 3283 | 12.548% | Acta Orthopaedica Et Traumatologica Turcica | 71 | 19.03% |
| Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research | 1372 | 5.244% | Eklem Hastalıkları ve Cerrahijs Joint Diseases and Related Surgery | 30 | 8.04% |
| Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery American Volume | 1014 | 3.876% | Knee Surgery Sports Traumatology Arthroscopy | 25 | 6.7% |
| International Orthopaedics | 886 | 3.386% | Journal of Arthroplasty | 22 | 5.89% |
| Journal Of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery | 768 | 2.935% | Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery | 20 | 5.36% |
editor and editorial materials). With regard to the time periods, the articles published between 01.01.2006 and 31.05.2011 were 115 and more than doubled to 258 between 01.06.2011 and 31.12.2016. Thirty six of 115 articles (31%) were published in the top 10 ranked journals between 2006 and 2011, whereas 50 of 258 articles (19%) were published in the top 10 ranked journals between 2011 and 2016.

Discussion

Bibliometrics is a set of methods to quantitatively analyze academic literature.16,17 It can be a yardstick to assess the academic achievements of a country, institutions as well as individuals and can be used as a measure for their appraisal.18 To assess the research contributions around the world, biomedical research publication has been used as an index for scientific research productivity.19–21 However, as far as we know, this study is the first bibliometric evaluation on worldwide productivity in the field of arthroplasty research.

Arthroplasty researches have shown a considerable progress in recent years. This study clearly demonstrated that there was a significant increase in the number of arthroplasty publications from 2006 to 2016. The authors in the United States published the largest number of arthroplasty papers than any other country in the world. Besides the United States, some small European countries, including Switzerland and Denmark, were more productive when the total number of articles was normalized by population size with a population of over 1 billion, were naturally at the end of this ranking. The Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland) all ranked in the top in respect to both PmP and mean impact factor categories, and outperformed larger highly industrialized counterparts. Positive correlations between the number of publications and GDP per capita was also found in the study about worldwide productivity research in the field of arthroscopy.11 GDP or high income of a country is directly related with better education system and higher share allocated to research. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the quality and the quantity of arthroplasty publications are associated with high GDP per capita similar with other scientific fields. According to our data, another factor that strongly correlated with both PmP index and average citation was rate of funded study in the arthroplasty publication. We also determinate that GDP per capita and the foundation of arthroplasty publications were correlated. To our data, northern European countries which leads PmP and citation average ranking also have high foundation rates in arthroplasty publications. Only exception of this situation was China with 45.1% funded study of total publication. It can explain why China has three times more publications than India, which has the similar population. The availability of funding has been shown to result in higher publication output.22 Man et al22 stated that research funding rates may be directly responsible for increased publication output in high ranked journals. Lee et al29 investigated characteristics and trends of orthopedic publications between 2000 and 2009 and they reported that 10.2% of published orthopedic articles declared grants as funding source. This study demonstrated that the funding rate was 28.8% among arthroplasty studies when compared with general orthopedic studies. This situation may be explained with higher cost of arthroplasty studies and more industrial interest in arthroplasty publications than general orthopedics.

Gürbüz et al30 performed bibliometric analysis of orthopedic publications from Turkey. They stated that Turkey has ranked 14th regarding the number of orthopedic publications out of 122 countries and 26th out of 30 countries regarding the PmP index. In this study Turkey was 18th regarding the number of the articles but last according to average per item, h-index and rate of publication in top 10 ranked journals. First of all, the number of arthroplasty publications in the worldwide increased by 172% between 2006-2011 and 2011–2016, whereas the number of publications from Turkey increased by 123%. Despite quantitative increase of...
arthroplasty publications in Turkey, the growth rate has fallen below the world average. The rate of publications in the top 10 ranked journals was also in a decrease trend over time. Multiple reasons for this situation can be listed. The main reason may be the fact that Turkey was the last according to funding rate among the top 25 countries that published the most number of arthroplasty articles. National funding capacity for research is an important determinant of publication output. In Turkey only 0.01% of total GDP spent for medical research whereas this ratio is 0.47% for Sweden.32 We believe that more financial support for medical research will increase the scientific output Turkey.

Turkish authors tend to publish their studies in national journals (27% of total). The most-cited articles are likely to be published in journals with high impact factors.31 National orthopaedics journals of Turkey have relatively lower impact factors. Thus, low average of per item citation of Turkish arthroplasty articles can be attributed to low publication rate in the top 10 ranked journals. To ensure a qualitative increase in arthroplasty publication of Turkey more studies should be published in the journals with high impact factors. Another reason for quantitatively and qualitatively backwardness in arthroplasty publications relatively with the other European Countries may be the late establishment of national registration system in Turkey. Since 2009 a national registry system covers all hospitals in Turkey.32 Whereas Sweden has arthroplasty registry system since 1979.33 The use of registry system provides access to a large number of patients and gross data. This may have increased the number of publications in the field of arthroplasty.34 And also, registry publications are more often cited.33 We believe that the effective use of national registry system will affect positively on arthroplasty publication productivity of Turkey.

In the United States 21% of the orthopedic residents desire to pursue a fellowship in hip or knee arthroplasty, which represented the second most popular fellowship choice following sports medicine.35 And also, the top ten adult reconstruction fellowship programs account for approximately two-thirds of all published arthroplasty research in the United States.36 However, there is no official adult reconstruction fellowship programme for orthopedic residents in Turkey. We suggest that an adult reconstruction fellowship programme may increase arthroplasty publications in Turkey. Moreover, the results and the conclusions of this study may serve as a guide for orthopedic residents who pursue an academic career in the field of adult reconstruction and may help them to consider some of the most productive institutions in terms of arthroplasty publication.

Our study demonstrated that universities dominate the arthroplasty literature published from Turkey. This finding is consistent with the literature from other countries.37 In most universities, the publications are the principal currency for academic recognition and promotion for researchers.38 Despite more arthroplasty surgery is performed than university hospitals,39 the state education and training hospitals and other state hospitals are mainly concentrated on public service which may be considered for the reason of low publication rate. Scientific productivity may be rewarded for these institutions to promote publication rate.

There were several limitations in the present study. First, the WoS database was used to search for arthroplasty studies. Articles published in none WoS-cited journals were not included. This may be accepted as a shortcoming of this study. Citation analysis was used to evaluate quality of the articles and it is acknowledged that the number of citations are a proxy measure of influence reflecting the recognition and quality of the published research by its peers.40 Nevertheless, over citation, biased citing, audience size, biased data, and ignorance of the literature are additional common criticisms of bibliometric studies.40 Another potential limitation of this method is collecting data over a specific time period. These results will almost certainly change if the time interval is either extended or shortened. And lastly, instead of using the h index, to normalize article number by the number of researchers in arthroplasty field in different countries might be more informative, but it is extremely difficult to get these data. However, given its broad nature and large numbers, this study still provides a comprehensive survey of arthroplasty research productivity, which may serve to track overall trends and identify topics of interest. To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first bibliometric evaluation on the worldwide research productivity in the field of arthroplasty.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated that there is a rapid increase in the number of articles in arthroplasty research from 2006 to 2016. The United States was the most productive country as measured by total publications, but when adjusted for population, Switzerland published the highest number of articles, followed by Denmark and Scotland. GDP per capita and research foundation positively affect the quality and quantity of arthroplasty publications.

Financial disclosure
None reported.

Conflicts of interest
None reported.

References

1. Vose PB, Cervellini A. Technical co-operation: problems of scientific research in developing countries. IAEA Bull. 1983;25(2):37.
2. Frist WH. Federal funding for biomedical research: commitment and benefits. JAMA. 2002;287(13):1722–1724.
3. Nathan DG. Clinical research: perceptions, reality, and proposed solutions. National Institutes of Health Director’s cabinet on clinical research. JAMA. 1998;280(16):1427–1431.
4. May RM. The scientific wealth of nations. Science. 1997;275(5301):793.
5. Langer A, Diaz-Olavarrieta C, Bredichovsky K, Villar J. Why is research from developing countries underrepresented in international health literature, and what can be done about it? Bull World Health Organ. 2004;82(10):802–803.
6. Michalopoulos A, Falagas ME. A bibliometric analysis of global research production in respiratory medicine. Chest. 2005;128(6):3993–3998.
7. Hauptman JS, Chow DS, Martin NA, Ragaki MW. Research productivity in neurosurgery: trends in globalization, scientific focus, and funding. J Neurosurg. 2011;115(6):1262–1272.
8. Vergidis PI, Karavasilis AT, Paraschos K, Biziotis IA, Falagas ME. Bibliometric analysis of global trends for research productivity in microbiology. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2005;24(5):342–346.
9. Hui Z, Yi Z, Peng J. Bibliometric analysis of the orthopedic literature. Orthopedics. 2015;38(10):e1225–e1232.
10. Luo X, Liang Z, Gong F, et al. Worldwide productivity in the field of foot and ankle research from 2006 to 2013: a bibliometric analysis of highly cited journals. J Foot Ankle Res. 2015;8(12):1–6.
11. Liang Z, Luo X, Gong F, et al. Worldwide research productivity in the field of arthroscopy: a bibliometric analysis. Arthroscopy. 2015;31(8):1452–1457.
12. Zhang WJ, Ding W, Jiang H, et al. Research productivity in orthopaedic surgery: a bibliometric analysis of highly cited journals. Plast Surg. 2013;27(2):231–234.
13. Li Q, Jiang Y, Zhang M. National representation in the emergency medicine literature: a bibliometric analysis of highly cited journals. Am J Emerg Med. 2012;30(8):1530–1534.
14. Li Z, Qiu LX, Wu FX, et al. Assessing the national productivity in subspecialty critical care medicine journals: a bibliometric analysis. J Crit Care. 2012;27(5):747.e1–747.e5.
15. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD.
16. Kelly JC, Glynn RW, O’Briain DE, Felle P, McCabe JP. The 100 classic papers of field of surgical oncology. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2010;92(10):1338–1343.
17. Similowski T, Derenne JP. Bibliometry of biomedical periodicals. Rev Mal Respir. 1995;12(6):543–553.
18. Luukkonen T. Bibliometrics and evaluation of research performance. Ann Med. 1990;22(3):145–150.
19. Bakker IS, Wevers KP, Hoekstra HJ. Geographical distribution of publications in the scientific field of surgical oncology. J Surg Oncol. 2013;108(8):505–507.
20. Bould MD, Boet S, Riem N, Kasanda C, Sossou A, Bruppacher HR. National representation in the anaesthesia literature: a bibliometric analysis of highly cited anaesthesia journals. Anaesthesia. 2010;65(8):799–804.

21. Cheng T, Zhang G. Worldwide research productivity in the field of rheumatology from 1996 to 2010: a bibliometric analysis. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2013;52(9):1630–1634.

22. Man JP, Weinkauf JG, Tsang M, Sin DD. Why do some countries publish more than others? An international comparison of research funding, English proficiency and publication output in highly ranked general medical journals. Eur J Epidemiol. 2004;19(8):811–817.

23. Choi J, You JS, Joo YS, Kong T, Ko DR, Chung SP. A bibliometric analysis of research productivity of emergency medicine researchers in South Korea. Clin Exp Emerg Med. 2016;3(4):245–251.

24. Jamjoom BA, Jamjoom AB. Impact of country-specific characteristics on scientific productivity in clinical orthopaedic journals. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2006;88(2):156–158.

25. King DA. The scientific impact of nations. Nature. 2004;430(6997):311–316.

26. Bosker BH, Verheyen CC. The International rank order of publications in major clinical orthopaedic journals from 2000 to 2004. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2006;88(2):156–158.

27. Kennedy C, Sullivan PO, Bilal M, Walsh A. Ireland’s contribution to orthopaedic literature: a bibliometric analysis. Surg. 2013;11(5):267–271.

28. Moe SA, Al Masri AA, Ulusami AM, Memnon AN, Zaidi SZ. Impact of GDP, spending on R&I and number of universities and scientific journals on research publications among Asian countries. PLoS One. 2013;8(6):1–8.

29. Lee KM, Ryu MS, Chung CY, Choi DH, Kwon DG, Kim TW, Sung KH, Seo SG, Park MS. Characteristics and Trends of Orthopaedic Publications between 2000 and 2009. Clin Orthop Surg. 2011;3(3):225–229.

30. Gürbüz Y, Sığınım TS, Özkavsar K. A bibliometric analysis of orthopedic publications originating from Turkey. Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc. 2015;49(1):57–66.

31. Cassar Gheit AJ, Downey RE, Byrne DP, Molony DC, Mulhall KJ. The 25 most cited articles in arthroscopic orthopaedic surgery. Arthroscopy. 2012;28(4):548–564.

32. Ceyhan E, Gursoy S, Akkaya M, Ugurlu M, Koksal I, Bozkurt M. Toward the Turkish national registry system: a prevalence study of total knee arthroplasty in Turkey. J Arthroplast. 2016;31(9):1878–1884.

33. Boyer P, Bouton I, Ravaud P. Scientific production and impact of national registers: the example of orthopaedic national registers. Osteoarthr Cartil. 2011;19(7):858–863.

34. Herbets P, Malchau H. How outcome studies have changed total hip arthroplasty practices in Sweden. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1997;344:44–60.

35. Harris S, York SC, O’Connor ML, Parsley RS, McCarthy JC. A resident survey study of orthopedic fellowship specialty decision making and views on arthroplasty as a career. J Arthroplast. 2011;26(6):961–968.

36. Formby FM, Pavey GJ, Van Blaricum GS, Mack AW, Newman MT. An analysis of research from faculty at U.S. Adult reconstruction fellowships. J Arthroplast. 2015;30(12):2376–2379.

37. Ajuied A, Back D, Smith C, Davies AJ, Wong F, Earnshaw PH. Publication trends in knee surgery: a review of the last 16 years. J Arthroplast. 2011;26(5):751–758.

38. Horton R. Publication and promotion. A fair reward. Lancet. 1998;352(9111):892.

39. Lefaivre KA, Shadgan B, O’Brien PJ. 100 most cited articles in orthopaedic surgery. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2011;469(5):1487–1497.

40. Mac Roberts MH, Mac Roberts BR. Problems of citation analysis. Scientometric. 1996;36(3):435–444.