

1 **Abstract**

2 *Purpose* An oversupply of qualified applicants leads to intense competition for the
3 limited number of first year orthopedic residency positions. Therefore, program directors
4 can be more selective in choosing their future residents. However, it is unclear if there are
5 resident characteristics that correspond with trainee performance.

6 *Methods* We asked (1) what resident characteristics are associated with subjective
7 residency performance score? and (2) what resident characteristics are associated with
8 Orthopedic In-Training Examination (OITE) score?

9 A total of 119 orthopedic residents accepted at the Harvard Combined Orthopedic
10 Residency Program from 1999 – 2009 were included in this study. The current program
11 director together with two former program directors in the selected time period defined
12 the subjective residency performance score based on the clinical skills of the residents
13 during training.

14 *Results* Former Olympic or varsity athlete ($p = 0.018$) and Alpha Omega Alpha (AOA)
15 status ($p = 0.014$) were associated with a better subjective residency performance score.
16 Higher USMLE step 1 score ($p = 0.0038$), known person within faculty prior to the
17 residency (did a research rotation, or local medical student) ($p = 0.041$), and AOA ($p =$
18 0.015) status were associated with a higher OITE score.

19 *Conclusions* AOA status of the applicant for orthopedic residency is associated with both
20 a higher OITE score and a better subjective residency performance score.

21 *Level of evidence* level 4

22

23 **Keywords:** orthopedic surgery, residency, selection process, interview

25 **Introduction**

26 The number of applicants for orthopedic residency programs consistently exceeds the
27 available number of positions each year (1). An oversupply of qualified applicants leads
28 to intense competition for the limited number of first year orthopedic residency positions.
29 This allows program directors to be more selective in choosing their future residents (1,
30 2).

31 A few studies address the factors involved in selecting residency applicants, but
32 the results are inconsistent (3-8). For example, Carmichael *et al.* (8) looked at age at the
33 start of residency and Orthopedic In-Training Examination (OITE) scores and found no
34 association. On the other hand, Clark *et al.* (2) found that successful orthopedic residency
35 applicants were significantly younger. The mean age of successful candidates was 26
36 years and the mean age of unsuccessful candidates was 28 years (2).

37 It is not clear whether factors used to select residents correlate with performance
38 during residency or later as orthopedic surgeons. We studied resident characteristics
39 associated with their performance as a resident. Specifically, we studied the following
40 markers for resident performance: (1) subjective residency performance score and (2)
41 OITE score. Our primary null hypothesis was that there were no resident characteristics
42 associated with subjective residency performance score and our secondary hypothesis
43 was that there were no resident characteristics associated with OITE score

44

45

46 **Methods**

47 Our institutional review board approved this retrospective study. We included all
48 accepted orthopedic residents at the Harvard Combined Orthopedic Residency Program
49 from 1999 – 2009 (Table 1). One resident was excluded, because the application form
50 was missing. A total of 119 orthopedic residents were included.

51 Our primary outcome measure was a subjective residency performance score as
52 outcome measure. The current program director together with two former program
53 directors in the selected time period defined the subjective residency performance score
54 based on the clinical skills and interim evaluation forms of the residents during training.
55 This resulted in a subjective resident performance from 1 (best score) to 3 (lowest score).
56 We took the mean score and rounded up when there was a discrepancy in resident
57 performance scores.

58 Our secondary outcome measure was the OITE score. This examination is a
59 measure of orthopedic medical knowledge of residents and is used by all American
60 Orthopedic residency programs on a yearly basis. Based on the first OITE score from the
61 training records the resident was categorized in the following quartiles: <25%; 25-50%;
62 51-75%; >75%.

63 We included the following explanatory variables: age, sex, nationality, marital
64 status, advanced research degree (e.g. masters, PhD), number of publications (0, <5, 5-10,
65 > 10), United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE) step one (<192, 192-228,
66 229-264, > 264), match ranking (the number the applicant was ranked during the
67 interviews), former Olympic or varsity athlete, musical instrument (in orchestra or band),
68 involvement in charity, management experience (e.g. organizing a congress, conference

69 or event), known person within faculty (performed previous internship/rotation/or
70 elective with faculty), entrepreneur background, and Alpha Omega Alpha (AOA) status.
71 Data was gathered from letters of recommendation, resumes and application forms of the
72 resident.

73 Two residents quit residency during the program.

74

75 *Statistical analysis*

76 Continuous variables were described using means with standard deviations, and with
77 medians and interquartile ranges if inspection of the data showed non-normality.

78 Categorical variables were presented with frequency and percentage statistics.

79 In bivariate analyses, the association of the outcome measure resident
80 performance score and explanatory variables was assessed using a Fishers exact test for
81 dichotomous variables, and a Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous and categorical
82 variables.

83 The association of the outcome measure OITE score and explanatory variables
84 was assessed using a Mann-Whitney U test for dichotomous variables, and a Spearman's
85 rank correlation coefficient for continuous and categorical variables.

86 All analyses were performed with Stata 13 (StataCorp LP). A two-tailed *p* value
87 smaller than 0.05 was considered significant.

88

89

90 **Results**

91 Former Olympic or varsity athlete ($p = 0.018$) and AOA status ($p = 0.014$) were
92 associated with a better subjective residency performance score (Table 2).

93 Higher USMLE step 1 score ($p = 0.0038$), known person within faculty prior to
94 the residency (did a research rotation, or local medical student) ($p = 0.041$), and AOA (p
95 = 0.015) status were associated with a higher OITE score (Table 3).

96

97

98 **Discussion**

99 There is strong competition for the limited number of first year orthopedic residency
100 positions (1, 2). Therefore program directors can be more selective in choosing their
101 future residents. However, it is unclear if there are resident characteristics that correspond
102 with trainee performance. The primary null hypothesis of this study was that there were
103 no resident characteristics associated with a subjective residency performance score.
104 We found that former Olympic or varsity athlete and AOA status were associated with a
105 better subjective residency performance score.

106 This study should be interpreted with its limitations in mind. First, the data
107 registry is drawn from the Harvard Combined Orthopedic Residency Program and might
108 not be representative of other residency programs. Second, the retrospective study design
109 is somewhat susceptible to data loss, bias, and confounding, although we felt this was
110 likely uncommon. Third, our measures (e.g. a higher OITE score) are surrogates for
111 actual performance as a surgeon. Fourth, there might be more factors that can influence
112 residence acceptance, such as for example likability. However, it is not possible to
113 analyze this. Lastly, the residency performance score is a subjective score given by the
114 program directors.

115 Our study showed that former Olympic or varsity athlete status was associated
116 with a better subjective residency performance score. This might be due to perseverance
117 to reach a goal. However, it is shown that extracurricular activities were ranked relatively
118 less important in the selection process for residents (9). Our results showed that AOA
119 status was associated with a better subjective residency performance score. Several
120 studies showed that medical school honors grades were associated with more career

121 potential (2, 10-13). Dirschl *et al.* attempted to correlate residency selection
122 characteristics with subsequent faculty evaluations (14). The faculty members were asked
123 to evaluate the residents in psychomotor, affective, cognitive, and overall performance.
124 Clinical clerkship performances as indicated by honors grades was found to have the
125 highest correlation to overall resident performance, and AOA status was second (14).

126 We found that a higher USMLE step 1 score was associated with higher OITE
127 scores. This is consistent with the study of Carmichael *et al.* that showed that residents
128 with an USMLE step 1 score of 220 or lower had a lower OITE score as compared to the
129 residents with a score above 220 (8). It makes some sense that test scores are consistent,
130 because applicants that had high scores at USMLE step 1 are probably good test takers
131 and will do well at the OITE test too. Our study showed that a known person within the
132 faculty was associated with higher OITE scores. An explanation might be that only the
133 best applicants known within faculty will get accepted to the program. Previous studies
134 reported that taking an elective in the program director's hospital and specialty seems to
135 be of great importance in the selection procedure of orthopedic residents (1, 4, 15-17).
136 Bernstein *et al.* found that performing a rotation at the director's institution was ranked as
137 most important (1). Another study found that the most important academic criterion in the
138 selection of residents among orthopedic program directors was the candidates grade in his
139 or her orthopedic senior elective (4). In 1986, Wagoner *et al.* found that 86% of program
140 directors across multiple medical and surgical specialties gave preference to students who
141 performed well in an elective in the program director's specialty and hospital (16). We
142 found that AOA status was associated with a higher OITE score. An explanation might
143 be that the OITE score and AOA status are both based on knowledge. This is consistent

144 with the study of Carmichael *et al.* (8). Several studies reported that AOA membership
145 was one of the strongest predictors of a successful application for orthopedic residency
146 (1, 2, 4).

147 **Conclusions**

148 In conclusion, AOA status of the applicant is associated with a higher OITE score and a
149 better subjective residency performance score. Future studies should focus on objective
150 clinical measurements of the resident's performance.

151

152 **Acknowledgements:** none

153 **Disclosure:** there were no conflicts of interest.

154

155 **References**

- 156 1. Bernstein AD, Jazrawi LM, Elbeshbeshy B, Della Valle CJ, Zuckerman JD. An
157 analysis of orthopaedic residency selection criteria. *Bull Hosp Jt Dis.* 2002;61(1-2):49-
158 57.
- 159 2. Clark R, Evans EB, Ivey FM, Calhoun JH, Hokanson JA. Characteristics of
160 successful and unsuccessful applicants to orthopedic residency training programs. *Clin*
161 *Orthop Relat Res.* 1989(241):257-64.
- 162 3. Scherl SA, Lively N, Simon MA. Initial review of Electronic Residency
163 Application Service charts by orthopaedic residency faculty members. Does applicant
164 gender matter? *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2001;83-A(1):65-70.
- 165 4. Wagoner NE, Suriano JR. Program directors' responses to a survey on variables
166 used to select residents in a time of change. *Acad Med.* 1999;74(1):51-8.
- 167 5. Zagumny MJ, Rudolph J. Comparing medical students' and residency directors'
168 ratings of criteria used to select residents. *Acad Med.* 1992;67(9):613.
- 169 6. Taylor CA, Mayhew HE, Weinstein L. Residency directors' responses to the
170 concept of a proposed electronic residency application service. *Acad Med.*
171 1994;69(2):138-42.
- 172 7. Ross CA, Leichner P. Criteria for selecting residents: a reassessment. *Can J*
173 *psychiatry.* 1984;29(8):681-6.
- 174 8. Carmichael KD, Westmoreland JB, Thomas JA, Patterson RM. Relation of
175 residency selection factors to subsequent orthopaedic in-training examination
176 performance. *South Med J.* 2005;98(5):528-32.

- 177 9. Crane JT, Ferraro CM. Selection criteria for emergency medicine residency
178 applicants. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2000;7(1):54-60.
- 179 10. Dorsey ER, Raphael BA, Balcer LJ, Galetta SL. Predictors of future publication
180 record and academic rank in a cohort of neurology residents. *Neurology.*
181 2006;67(8):1335-7.
- 182 11. Lawton MT, Narvid J, Quinones-Hinojosa A. Predictors of neurosurgical career
183 choice among residents and residency applicants. *Neurosurgery.* 2007;60(5):934-9;
184 discussion -9.
- 185 12. Bilbey JH, Fache JS, Burhenne HJ. Are there predictors for future academic
186 radiologists? A Canadian survey. *Can Assoc Radiol J.* 1992;43(5):369-73.
- 187 13. McCaffrey JC. Medical student selection of otolaryngology-head and neck
188 surgery as a specialty: influences and attitudes. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.*
189 2005;133(6):825-30.
- 190 14. Dirschl DR, Dahners LE, Adams GL, Crouch JH, Wilson FC. Correlating
191 selection criteria with subsequent performance as residents. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.*
192 2002(399):265-71.
- 193 15. Garden FH, Smith BS. Criteria for selection of physical medicine and
194 rehabilitation residents. A survey of current practices and suggested changes. *Am J Phys*
195 *Med Rehabil.* 1989;68(3):123-7.
- 196 16. Wagoner NE, Suriano JR, Stoner JA. Factors used by program directors to select
197 residents. *J Med Educ.* 1986;61(1):10-21.

198 17. Sherry E, Mobbs R, Henderson A. Becoming an orthopaedic surgeon: background
199 of trainees and their opinions of selection criteria for orthopaedic training. Aust N Z J
200 Surg. 1996;66(7):473-7.

201