Editorial

Editorial—Going Global: *CORR*® Best-paper Awards for China and Latin America in 2015

Seth S. Leopold MD

As the world's general-interest orthopaedic journal, *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*® takes seriously its obligations to help support and disseminate research from scientists the world over.

Musculoskeletal injury and illness do not respect political borders, and so *CORR*® is proud to focus global expertise on global problems, and share the solutions with a truly global readership.

The author certifies that he, or any members of his immediate family, has no commercial associations (eg, consultancies, stock ownership, equity interest, patent/licensing arrangements, etc) that might pose a conflict of interest in connection with the submitted article.

All ICMJE Conflict of Interest Forms for authors and *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*® editors and board members are on file with the publication and can be viewed on request.

The opinions expressed are those of the writers, and do not reflect the opinion or policy of *CORR*® or The Association of Bone and Joint Surgeons®.

S. S. Leopold MD (✉)
Clinical Orthopaedics and Related
Research®, Philadelphia, PA 19103,
USA
e-mail: sleopold@clinorthop.org

Between 2012 and 2015, consumption of *CORR*'s content—as measured by downloads—has nearly doubled. In 2015, readers downloaded this Journal's articles about 2 million times; some 60% of this usage came from outside North America. The research we publish, likewise, is global in origin; about half of *CORR*'s papers come from non-US centers. Our diverse editorial team includes more than two dozen international editors. This is critically important to us; cultural issues matter, local knowledge is invaluable, and specific editorial expertise about the patient populations surveyed helps us—and our readers—get the most out of the manuscripts we receive.

We feel strongly that solving problems affecting all the world's citizens calls for research from all around the world. With that in mind, we are proud to sponsor—and pleased to announce the winners of—a number of awards that help promote research in regions where the scientific infrastructure is still developing.

The winners of the 2015 *CORR* Best-paper Awards for China and Latin America were chosen from among those papers published electronically in the Journal in the last

12 months, and they represent some can't-miss reading.

The winner of the *CORR* Best-paper from China Award for 2015 came from Lanzhou University in northwest China, and is titled “Does Arthroplasty Provide Better Outcomes Than Internal Fixation At Mid- and Long-term Followup? A Meta-analysis” (DOI: [10.1007/s11999-015-4345-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-015-4345-3)). This paper by Jiang and colleagues [3] is not the first meta-analysis on femoral neck fracture treatment. In contrast to so many other important therapeutic dilemmas in orthopaedic surgery where the evidence is scanty, numerous well-designed randomized trials have compared surgical treatments for hip fractures. As such, earlier reports have pooled data on this subject [2, 4]. But this award-winning paper is special because it evaluates studies presenting longer-term followup using methods that are uncommonly robust, and so its conclusions—the functional benefits of arthroplasty are not offset by any discernible increase in mortality associated with that larger procedure—appear definitive. This is an enormous clinical problem, and we congratulate the authors on a job well done.

Editorial

The *CORR* Best-paper from Latin America Award for 2015 goes to Dr. Aponte-Tinao and his team at the Carlos E. Ottolenghi Institute of Orthopedics in Buenos Aires, for their work, “What Are the Risk Factors and Management Options for Infection After Reconstruction With Massive Bone Allografts?” (DOI: [10.1007/s11999-015-4353-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-015-4353-3)). This paper is an example of the power of the case series. Through careful data collection and analysis, the authors determined that surgical débridement of the infected bone allograft generally was not sufficient treatment, and that complete resection generally was called for [1]. In those patients whose grafts were resected, repeat reconstruction with allograft proved to be a dangerous

choice, and the authors conclude that alternatives—perhaps including endoprosthesis reconstruction—might be better. We congratulate Dr. Aponte-Tinao’s group on a thoughtful analysis of a desperately difficult problem.

We look forward to presenting these awards again in 2016, and we encourage scientists from China and Latin America to send their best work to *CORR* for consideration.

References

1. Aponte-Tinao LA, Ayerza MA, Muscolo DL, Farfalli GL. What are the risk factors and management options for infection after reconstruction with massive bone allografts? [Published online ahead of print May 20, 2015]. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. DOI: [10.1007/s11999-015-4353-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-015-4353-3).
2. Bhandari M, Devereaux PJ, Swiontkowski MF, Tornetta P, Obremsky W, Koval KJ, Nork S, Sprague S, Schemitsch EH, Guyatt GH. Internal fixation compared with arthroplasty for displaced fractures of the femoral neck: A meta-analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2003;85A:1673–1681.
3. Jiang J, Yang C-h, Lin Q, Yun X-d, Xia Y-y. Does arthroplasty provide better outcomes than internal fixation at mid- and long-term followup? A meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2015;473:2673–2679.
4. Yu L, Wang Y, Chen J. Total hip arthroplasty versus hemiarthroplasty for displaced femoral neck fractures: A meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2012;470:2235–2243.